

A HISTORY OF GINGEE AND ITS RULERS

BY

RAO BAHADUR

C. S. SRINIVASACHARI, M. A.

Professor of History, Annamalai University.

WITH A FOREWORD

BY

DR. SIR C. R. REDDY, Kt., (Hon.) D.Litt., M.L.C.,

Vice-Chancellor, Andhra University.



**PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY,
ANNAMALAINAGAR.**

1943

954-2
C.774-W

ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY HISTORICAL SERIES

1. Bhoja Raja.
2. A History of Gingee and its Rulers.
3. The Nayaks of Tanjore.
4. A History of Hindu India (in Tamil).
5. Maratha Rule in the Carnatic (in the press)

29841

Printed by
THE DE NOBILI PRESS,
MADURA.

DEDICATION

IN
GRATEFUL APPRECIATION
OF
THE GREAT AND MANIFOLD SERVICES
RENDERED TO
THE CAUSE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
IN
SOUTH INDIA,
THIS BOOK, IS WITH HIS KIND PERMISSION,
RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED
BY THE AUTHOR
TO
Dr. RAJAH SIR ANNAMALAI CHETTIAR
OF
CHETTINAD
FOUNDER-PRO-CHANCELLOR
OF
THE ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY.

FOREWORD

BY

DR. SIR C. R. REDDY, K.T., (HON.) D. LITT., M.L.C.,
Vice-Chancellor, Andhra University.

Mr. C. S. Srinivasachari, M. A., Professor of History, Annamalai University, has done me the honour to invite me to contribute a Foreword to his monumental *History of Gingee and its Rulers*. Good wine needs no bush. Mr. Srinivasachari, one of our leading Scholars and Researchers in Indian History, needs no introduction. His books speak for themselves. There is no need for anybody else to speak for them. And this is only a Foreword, not a critical review and appreciation, which will naturally be undertaken in due course by the Historians in South India.

One of the results of the foundation of the Annamalai University has been, curiously enough, masterly contributions to the elucidation of Telugu history and culture in the Tamil country. The Nayak dynasties of Madhura (Madura), Tanjavooru (Tanjore) and Chengie (Gingee) have found their first critical and scholarly histories in the Schools of the Annamalai University, of which one of the earlier Directors was Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Aiyangar and of which the present illustrious Head is the author of this volume, Mr. Srinivasachari. The

pains that the author has taken to collect all the available material from archæological finds, from the vast literary output, more especially in Telugu and in Sanskrit under the patronage, auspices and authorship of these dynasties, and from the accounts found scattered in the correspondence of the Jesuit Fathers, are an example to the younger men engaged in such investigations. With a fallen and subject people like the Hindus, there is a tendency to be vainglorious and boastful of the past. For they that are not happy in the present and cannot find happiness in the sure and near advent of a more successful future, naturally have to console themselves by idealising the past. But our author and his School have avoided this fallacy of defeatist patriotism. They are scientific historians, not panegyrists.

People have sometimes wondered how Telugu dynasties could have so thoroughly dovetailed, as they had done, into the more ancient, more individual, and in some respects, the grander, civilisation of the Tamils. The Tamils have developed on lines of their own, and they constitute, in my opinion, in some respects at least, the finest flower of Dravidian genius. For instance, there is nothing in Telugu to approach anywhere near the grandeur of thought and sublimity of feeling found in *Śilappadikāram* and *Maṇimēkhalai*. The Saiva Siddhanta Philosophy is one of their most striking contributions to the vast mosaic of Hindu culture. And yet, the more militant and the more vigorous Telugus who stemmed the flow of Muhammadan

invasions and prevented them from inundating Hindu culture in Dravidisthan, naturalised themselves so thoroughly in the Tamil Nadu that the Telugu colonists spread out from the banks of the Palar to Tinnevely are to-day recognised to be part of the very flesh and blood of the Tamil folk. I can only explain this by the synthetic genius of the Hindu Dharma. It is difficult to translate this term, 'Dharma,' into English. It did not create unity in the sense of uniformity. But until the disruptive influences of the most recent developments and critical, equalitarian re-valuations were felt, it served to produce a certain harmony between all the elements comprised under the generic term, "Hindu," however divergent. Each Order or Caste or Community was not merely reconciled to its own position, but actively, on the basis of such reconciliation, cooperated with the other Orders, without questioning the justice of the gradations and degradations that had been evolved or instituted. And so there was sympathy between race and race, and Order and Order, and even creed and creed like Buddhism and Jainism. The Kushans, the Scythians and hordes of foreign races became in this sense Hinduised, kept distinct like the Rajputs, but not separate, and made members of one grand body social and cultural. This is the secret and miracle of our History. So long as our Dharma was a living force and had not spent itself out, we had in India various creeds, various races, various languages, various states, but along with this variety, the unity, without uniformity, of one society, one culture and one civilisation.

True, the days when Dharma could work this great miracle have now gone, never to be recalled. Hindu Society has to reconstitute itself on a newer, equalitarian basis, if it is to meet successfully the demands of the present and the future.

Mr. Srinivasachari's book is illustrative of the epic days of South India in which Tamil and Telugu mixed to produce the great Nayak civilisation. In literature, in architecture, in music, as in the arts of war and of politics, these are chapters that shine with imperishable glory. Living as we are, in the new order of the British which, though it has produced great changes, has not become the life and atmosphere of the country, like the Dharma of old, and preparing as we are, for a new order in India which would enable the country to play a glorious part in the comity of nations, it behoves us to understand both the remote and the more recent past; and we can never be too grateful to writers like Mr. Srinivasachari for the charming manner and beautiful style in which they present, scientifically and without bias, the facts and lessons of our history.

(Camp) Chittoor, }
22nd. May, 1943. }

C. R. REDDY.

PREFATORY NOTE

The author first brought out an account of the history of Gingee in small compass in 1912. Extracts from this book were incorporated into the supplementary volume of the *South Arcot District Gazetteer* (Vol. II. *Statistical Appendix* (1932)—pp. LXXVIII—LXXIX). Subsequently, the author expanded the scope of the treatment and utilised more fully the materials available for the study of the subject. In 1938, Mon. Edmond Gaudart, *Gouverneur en retraite* and President of the *Societe de L'Histoire de l'Inde Française*, Pondicherry, offered to have the enlarged text translated into French by himself and published under the auspices of his Society. The French Translation was enriched with a number of illustrations of the views of the Gingee fortifications (several of which were taken from photo-negatives in the possession of the Archaeological Survey of India) and with a plan of the forts as they were at the commencement of the 18th century and drawn by the French engineers of the time; and it was published in March 1940 (Pondicherry *Bibliothèque Publique, Rue des Capucins*, and Paris, Ernest Leroux, 108, Boulevard St. Germain :-pp. 243).

Subsequently additions were made to the textual matter with a view to making it as comprehensive as possible of the history of the surrounding country down to the close of the 18th century. The

fortunes of Gingee as they developed through the centuries, are illustrative of the vicissitudes through which this part of the Carnatic passed,—first emerging under indigenous tribal occupation, then coming under Chola rule and under the sway of Vijayanagar and of its Nayak governors, subsequently serving as the battle-field of Bijapurian and Kutb Shahi ambitions in the Carnatic, also utilised by Shahji and Shivaji—with a prevision that is certainly astonishing—as a possible southern base for future Maratha resistance to the Mussalmans, consequently experiencing a long-drawn-out siege by Aurangzib's forces, and after its incorporation into Mughal dominion, flourishing for a time as the headquarters of the Mughal *subah* of the Carnatic. The 18th century witnessed a kaleidoscopic succession of quick-changing scenes of which Gingee was the centre. First, the emergence of the brilliant, but short-lived and misdirected, chivalry of Raja Desing, the well-known hero of ballad and legend; next, the appearance on the scene of the French under the famous soldier, Bussy, the consequent exposure of the fortress to the violent interplay of the political forces that indulged in their 'Witches' Revel' in the decades that saw the birth of British supremacy, during which some stirring figures passed over the scene, *e.g.*, Bussy, the ill-fated Nasir Jang and the adventurous Hyder Ali. The architectural and monumental glories of Gingee are even now intact, in substantial volume and preservation, and claim for it a rank among the largest and most striking of the historic fortresses of our land.

In the preparation of this book, the author has been helped in a variety of ways by and is most thankful to his students, Mr. K. Subrahmanyam, M.A., L.T. and Mr. V. Vriddhagirisan, M.A., M.Litt., L.T., and also to Dr. T. V. Mahalingam, M.A., D.Litt., of the Madura College, Madura.

He is under a great debt of obligation to Dr. Sir C. R. Reddy, Kt., D.Litt., M.L.C., Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University, for his kind and encouraging Foreword. To the late Mon. Gaudart whose helpful attitude to all students of South Indian History is to be greatly cherished, he owes a debt of gratitude that is not easily repayable. He is thankful to the Annamalai University for undertaking this publication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
Chapter I A Description of Gingee Fort —Its Origin 	1
Chapter II The Beginnings of Gingee	27
Chapter III Gingee under the Vijayana- gara Nayaks 	65
Chapter IV The Rule of Krishnappa Na- yaka 	131
Chapter V The Mussalman Conquest of Gingee 	152
Appendices ...	183
Chapter VI Gingee under Bijapuri and Maratha Rule 	206
Chapter VII The Mughal Siege and Cap- ture of Gingee ...	286
Chapter VIII Gingee under the Mughals— The Period of Bundela Rule (1)	351
Chapter IX The Period of Bundela Rule (2)	410
Chapter X Gingee under the Nawabs of Arcot and the European Powers 	437
Index 	537
Bibliography 	627
Errata List	

Illustrations :—

General View of the Pallava Temple, Melacheri, Gingee.

Gingee : General View of the Ranganatha Temple at Singavaram.

„ : General View of the Kalyana Mahal and Entrance to the Zenana.

„ : View from the South of Krishnagiri with Buildings.

„ : View from the North-East of the Audience Hall on the Krishnagiri Hill, showing the Krishna Temple.

„ : General View of Rajagiri Hill in the background with the Venkataramana-swami Temple in the foreground.

„ : View from the East of the Rajagiri Hill with the main entrance to the Citadel.

„ : Bird's-eye view from the North-East of the Buildings at the bottom of the hills from Krishnagiri.

„ : General View of Chandrayan Drug from the Krishnagiri Hill.

„ : The Pondicherry Gate and the Royal Battery.

Map of Gingee and the Surrounding Country.

Jai Singh of Gingee (Desing ?)

Gingee at the commencement of the 18th century.

(A Plan of the Fortress.)

Fort St. David at the time of the French attack, May 1758.

A History of Gingee and its Rulers

CHAPTER I

A Description of Gingee Fort—Its Origin

Nothing arrests the attention of a traveller in India more than the appearance of the innumerable ruined fortresses and other vestiges of ancient glory that lie scattered all over the country. Each mournful relic has got its own tale to tell of the ruthless vandalism of the foreign invader, the bitter violence of internecine warfare or the languishing inertness of successive dynasties of Indian rulers. Besides the architectural attraction they display to students of art, they embody in themselves a world of political strife, triumph and defeat, which has an undying interest for the historian.

Up in the north-western corner of the district of South Arcot, extending for about fourteen or fifteen miles, in the centre of the newly-formed taluk of Gingee, are several hills (lat. 12° 10' to 12° 18': long. 79° 25' to 79° 30') whose summits are very jagged, each consisting of a central stratified rock covered with huge rounded boulders devoid of all vege-

the lower fort and the hills served as the citadels of the entire fort area. The lower fort between the hills was pierced by two entrances, one on the north by the Arcot or Vellore Gate and another on the east known as the Pondicherry Gate.

The strongest and the highest of the hills is the Rājagiri, also called the Great Mountain. On account of its precipitous height, the hill ought to have been totally inaccessible before it came to be fortified. This rock is 500 to 600 feet high at its top levels; and on the summit of it, rising above the ridge is the innermost citadel surrounded by strong walls that render an escalade impossible except on the north flank where, however, nature has provided an additional means of rendering an attack impossible by a narrow and deep chasm about 24 feet in width and 60 feet in depth. This chasm has been further artificially deepened further. The entrance to the citadel, as we find it to-day, is by means of a wooden bridge thrown over it.*

The citadel can be reached by a fortified path and the narrow bridge leading to it al-

* Orme has probably alluded to this while referring to it as a point that could be held by ten men as against ten thousand. According to one traveller; "within the fort stands a steep hill which nature hath made secure and art impregnable."

ready mentioned. Seven gates have to be traversed before reaching the citadel. Alongside the path to it is a grove of trees in which are a reservoir and a shrine to the Goddess Kamalakaṇṇi Amman. This goddess is one of the seven guardian Virgin Deities of the place; another goddess who is even now worshipped is Śeṇjiamman that is believed to have given the name Śeṇji to the fort and town. Buffaloes are usually offered as sacrifices at the annual festival conducted at the foot of the hill in honour of Kamalakaṇṇi Amman.

The temple of this goddess is the oldest spot in the place, probably older even than the nucleus of the fort; and hence people attach considerable importance to it. Kamalakaṇṇi Amman was, perhaps, identical with Śeṇjiamman who gave her name to the fortress. In front of her shrine we find a stone slab, $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet by $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet, with representations of a bow, five arrows, a buffalo's, a ram's and four human heads which refer to the sacrifices of men and animals that were practised. Colonel Branfill who visited Gingee in 1880 has referred to it in some detail in his account.

On the top of Rājagiri there is a temple dedicated to God Raṅganātha though the sanctum is now empty. Besides, there are a

mantapam built in the Vijayanagara style of architecture, two big brick granaries, a masonry flagstaff and a strongly built chamber that perhaps served as the treasury of the fort. A spring of clear water under two big boulders served the needs of the garrison. On the hill-side, a little below, is a small *mantapam*. There is a big cannon lying by the side (though now rusty), eleven feet long and about seven feet in circumference at the breach. The gun is a miniature of the famous cannon, Malliki Maidan, in its size and form.

Mosques, temples and pavilions jostle one another in picturesque confusion at the base of the hill. The old gate-ways of the fort have been walled up; and the new gaps in the walls made for carrying the road from Tindivanam to Tiruvaṇṇāmalai are now used as entrances into the enclosed fort area. The batteries between the Pondicherry and the Arcot Gates were probably erected by the French during their occupation of the place in the fifties of the eighteenth century. These batteries are marked in the sketch-map of Gingee attached to Orme's plans. The gates which are modern in their setting are the work of the French who occupied it for about ten years (1751-1761). From the old Pondicherry Gate we directly reach Sādatullah Khān's Mosque.

In the lower fort are found the ruins of the Veṅkataramaṇaswāmi Temple whose original tall graceful monolithic pillars are said to have been carried away to Pondicherry by the French and to have been built into the base of the statue of Dupleix in the Place de la Republique at that town. The stone car-stand at Sittāmūr nearby, which is still a township inhabited by a fairly numerous body of Jainas, is also said to have been built of stone-pieces dismantled from the Veṅkataramaṇaswāmi temple of Gingee. This temple is said to have been built by one Muthiālu Nāyakan. In 1860 a Jain official and a member of the Madras Provincial Service, Sri Bāliah, took away a number of stone pieces from Gingee to Sittāmūr; among them the great stone elephants placed at the foot of the Tērmutti (car-stand), are noteworthy. The most admirable carvings in the Veṅkataramaṇaswāmi temple are found in the panels on either side of the gateway under the entrance; and they depict well known scenes from the Rāmāyaṇa, from the different incarnations of Vishnu and the Puranic legend of the churning of the ocean of milk by the Dēvās and the Aśurās.

The Pattābhi Rāmaswāmi temple is also deemed to be architecturally as important as, and perhaps even more than, the Veṅkata-

ramaṇaswāmi temple. The twelve-pillared *mantapam* in it constitutes its most conspicuous feature. In 1858 the Collector of South Arcot suggested the removal of its pillars to Madras and their utilisation as a base for the statue of General Neill, (the Madras hero of the Indian Mutiny) at Madras, which was then in process of manufacture. To the west of the Venṇataramaṇaswāmi Temple there is the tank known as the Āṇaikulam used for bathing elephants. Further west of the Āṇaikulam are situated the famous tanks, the Chakrakulam and the Chettikulam, the latter of which is said to have been built by one Rāma Shetty in the days of the Maratha occupation of the place and under the rule of Rājā Rām towards the end of the 18th century. Near the Chettikulam is a platform where Rājā Dēśing's (the hero who fought gloriously with the Nawab of Arcot and died on the field) body is said to have been burnt by order of the Nawab with full honours and in orthodox Hindu style. Between the two tanks is a large stone-image of Hanumān under a tottering *mantapam*.

Near the Chakkrakulam we see a big-sized boulder of rock, 15 to 20 feet high surmounted at the top with a low circular brick parapet wall. It is a natural hollow and artificially enlarged to some extent and now

looks like a dried-up well. This is called the Prisoners' Well, because it was at that site that those who were condemned to death were thrown down and left to die of starvation. This is referred to as one of the curiosities of the place by Garstin in the *South Arcot District Manual*.

In one of the gateways of the inner fort there is the little known shrine of Vēṇugōpālaswāmi which contains a stone slab depicting a remarkable piece of sculpture cut out in bold relief on the side of a mass of rock. Herein are carved a panel of Lord Krishna playing on the flute with his two wives, Rukmaṇi and Satyabhāma, and two female figures. This is the best piece of sculpture among the ruins of the place. The Vēṇugōpālaswāmi shrine is also mentioned in his account of the place by the Jesuit traveller, Father Pimenta, who visited Gingee in 1599 A. D.* We also see some brick-built and large-sized granaries and a gymnasium in the inner fort. Further east are to be found two great slabs of polished stone which are said to have served as bathing platforms used by Rāja Dēśing and his Rāṇi. To the north are found a long row of low buildings which perhaps served as horse stables in those days.

* Vide *The Indian Antiquary*, Vol. LIV, Pp. 42-43.

To the east of these buildings is situated the Kalyāṇamahāl, which is easily the architectural treasure of the place and the most conspicuous and attractive monument. The Mahāl consists of a square court surrounded by rooms for the ladies of the Raja's or governor's household; and in the middle of the rooms rises a square tower of eight storeys with a pyramidal roof. The plan of each storey is the same and consists of a single room about 8 feet square, surrounded by a verandah built on arches from which very narrow and steep stairways lead both upwards and downwards. Father Pimenta probably refers to it as the tower where the Nayak ruler lodged him and his companions. He calls it the rectangular court in the inner fort. The Kalyāṇamahāl is of the age and style of the Vijayanagara school. The only interesting feature in the building is a number of earthenware pipes leading even to the upper storeys, through which water issuing from the Chakrakulam situated about three furlongs from it was taken for the use of the inmates of the building.

One of the most singular features of the fortifications is the abundant water supply ensured for the inmates in all parts including the hills. There are two natural springs on the top of Rājagiri, one near the gate-way to

the citadel and the other on the summit of the rock. The quality of water obtained in these is said to be excellent and refreshingly cool. These pools never dry up even in the hottest part of the year; they are sheltered from the sun's rays on the sides by big boulders of rock, and protected from the heat. This is partly due to the fact that the tanks, Chakrakulam and Chettikulam, are fed by perennial springs.

Going next to Krishnagiri, the hill lying to the north of the Tiruvaṇṇāmalai road, we find that it is smaller in size and height than Rājagiri. It is noticed by Orme as "The English Mountain." A flight of steps of hewn granite pieces carries us to its top where are to be found several stone-built granaries and *mantapams*, an empty shrine to God Rāṅganātha, and the king's audience hall. These buildings are marked by a curious style of architecture including some traces of Islamic influence. The domed roof of the audience-chamber is supported by graceful and pointed brick-arches; and under the dome is a square platform equipped with a pillar at each corner and encircled on all sides with embrasured windows and comfortable window-seats. The chamber is open on all sides, takes in all the winds of heaven and commands a glorious view in every direction.

Below it is a hall fitted with hooks for swinging seats.

The Chandrāyan Drug and the Chakkili Drug were also fortified to some extent ; but their military and strategic value is relatively small. Their flanks are now completely covered with shrubs and stone pieces ; the visitor finds it a hard task to negotiate a climb up their sides and reach their tops.

Any account of Gingee should include a notice of the rock-cut shrine of Siṅgavaram situated $2\frac{1}{4}$ miles from the fortress. Siṅgavaram is a good specimen of the South Indian type of the rock-cut shrine. It is approached by a steep flight of steps. The recumbent deity, God Raṅganātha (Lord of the Assembly Hall) is said to have been the tutelary god of Rāja Dēśing. The image was hewn out of living rock and is about 24 feet long and is in the usual reclining posture, lying on the coils of the serpent Ananta. The head of the image is turned aside ; and according to the popular ballad of Rāja Dēśing, when the hero requested the God's blessing before proceeding to fight against Sādatullah Khān, the Nawab of Arcot, in 1714 A. D., the deity did not permit him to go to the battle and turned his head aside as a mark of his disapproval of Dēśing's head-strong haste.

Singavaram may be identified with the Bishun Gingee of the 18th century chronicles (Vishṇu Gingee). According to Scott Waring, there were two separate towns known as Sheo Gingee (Siva Gingee) and Bishun Gingee (Vishṇu Gingee), the latter being regarded by him as a popular and flourishing town. He also says that it was a pilgrim resort; and he supplements his notice of the place thus:—“The city venerable for its antiquity and supposed sanctity was entirely surrounded by Muslims who attacked it with great vigour and resolution. Gingee is one of the principal places of worship in South India. There are two great temples, the Sheo Gingee and Bishun Gingee surrounded by walls of considerable circumference. Within them are innumerable edifices of incredible value and also numerous and splendid temples. The breadth of the town is trifling, having only one street of shops with the houses and gardens of the inhabitants surrounding them. The tanks are numerous, faced with stony steps. Each tank has a separate name and a distinct season for bathing in it. The court of Sheo Gingee was formed into a citadel with basements and battlements and consequently thinly inhabited. Bishun Gingee was populous and flourishing and the resort of an immense number of pilgrims.” Hence the

Bishun Gingee of Scott Waring can, with great probability, be identified with Siṅgavaram which has been a well-known Vaiṣṇava shrine. The image of the god is believed to be the very one from the great Srīraṅgam temple that had been taken away from it for the sake of safety during its sack by the first Muhammadan invaders under Malik Kāfūr. The idol at Siṅgavaram is supposed to be larger than the one now at Srīraṅgam and people believe that the Siṅgavaram idol is the original one brought from Srīraṅgam during the Muhammadan invasions. According to E. Scott Waring [*A History of the Mahrattas* (1810) pp. 120-21], Siṅgavaram belonged to the jurisdiction of Gingee and hence we find that Gingee has often been referred to by some travellers as consisting of two towns, "the great and little Gingee surrounded by a wall three miles in circumference enclosing the two towns and five mountains of rugged rock on the summit of which are built five strong forts." The five mountains referred to, very probably included the Siṅgavaram hill, the four others being the Rājagiri, the Krishnagiri, the Chandrāyan Drug and the Chakkili Drug. According to E. Scott Waring, Great Gingee should refer to the whole area including Siṅgavaram; and Little Gingee was very likely the designation of Gingee proper,

i.e., the area covered by the four other mountains.

The limits of Great Gingee should have also comprehended Mēlachēri, or the village of Old Gingee which had also been obviously fortified. It formed the chief village of the Gingee *jaghir* claimed to have been granted by the Emperor of Delhi to one Sivanāth and the jurisdiction of which extended over seven *parganas*. Subsequently the *jaghir* came to be deprived of the *parganas* when it was granted to one Tējōnāth Singh by Lord William Bentinck, Governor of Madras (1803—1807).

Greater Gingee covered a vast area, as noted by acute observers like Orme, Pimenta, Branfill, Scott Waring and others. Father Pimenta's description of the fortress as "The Troy of the East" is also justifiable in some measure, though put in an extravagant simile.

The Gradual Development of the Fort

As observed by Garstin, it is impossible to be detailed or definite as to when and by whom the different fortifications were built. The great lines of battlemented thick stone-faced walls that stretch across the plain from Krishnagiri to Rājagiri and to the Chandrāyan Drug must have been of gradual forma-

tion. Perhaps the original wall was about five feet thick, built of granite pieces fitted into one another without any cementing mortar; and subsequently an earthen rampart about 25 feet thick was added behind the wall, with barracks and guard rooms built into its thickness at intervals. These ramparts are believed to have been built by the Marathas * during their occupation of the place in the years 1677—98. The letter of the Jesuit, Andre Freire, of 1678 written at the time of Sivaji's return from his South Indian campaign says that they were credited with the construction of the ramparts.

* Sivaji is credited with having immensely strengthened the fortifications, but it is difficult to believe that he could have done much, for he only came into the Carnatic in 1676 and left it in 1678; and unless he had armies of masons and workmen, it seems impossible that he could have constructed a hundredth part of the enormous length of works which exist, in the short space of 18 months, especially when we know that during 14 months of that time he was busy with the siege of Vellore, and that the country was, according to the Madras Records, "peeled to the bones."

It is highly probable that he did something towards strengthening the place, and that Rām Raja did the same, especially while threatened by the Mughal army of Zulfikār Khan during the eight years of the so-called siege, but the stupendous character of the works carried out, and the amount of time it must have taken to split off all the blocks of granite with which the works are faced throughout, and to move them into their places, seem to preclude the idea that the great works of circumvallation could have been constructed by the Marathas during their comparatively short and troubled tenure of the place of a little over two decades, and for

There are a few circular towers of stone here and there, some equipped with square gun-ports resembling Martello towers; they were apparently intended for a single gun to be worked from; and in one or two places may be seen "square gun-ports very much resembling those of a ship". "The style of these works may perhaps enable those learned in such matters to form their own opinion as to the constructors of different parts of the fortifications, but a few brick and mortar embrasures seem to mark the efforts of the French at strengthening the place while in their possession." (Garstin's *Manual*, p. 416).

The strongest part of the citadel, the Rājagiri, must have been constructed by the Vijayanagara Nayaks who enjoyed peaceful rule for a number of years and who were very

somewhat similar reasons we may also conclude that they were not the handiwork of the Bijapur governors of the fort in the preceding decades, while everything tends to strengthen the hypothesis that they were the work of the Vijayanagar Rayas and their governors. In the first place, the long and peaceful tenure of Gingee by that dynasty, a condition essentially necessary to admit of the construction of the works; next the general similarity in character of the whole; thirdly, the fact that, when captured by Bijapur, Gingee was a strong fortress; and lastly, the well-known skill of the Vijayanagara builders in carrying out immense works in stone, as evidenced by the ruins of Vijayanagar at Hampi, leave little doubt that the credit of building the fortress of Gingee belongs mainly, if not entirely, to that ancient dynasty.

likely largely responsible for the various improvements in the defences of the fort, though subsequent holders of the place like the Marathas and the French, added to its strength in several aspects.

The Fort at the Present Day; and its Conservation

The most remarkable ruins of the fort to-day are the Kalyāṇamahāl, the granaries, the *mantapams* and the French batteries. The temples at the base of the hill and some of the sculptures and remains therein are valuable even from an architectural point of view.

The Madras Government have been spending large sums of money in conserving the ruins of the place. The audience chamber in Krishnagiri was repaired after the cyclone of 1913. The approaches to Krishnagiri have been made easy by the repair of the flight of steps that were scattered before. Several portions of the Rājagiri fortress have also been restored. Near the Raja's and Rani's bathing-platforms is a stone roller about 6 feet in circumference and 10 feet in length; and by its side are found remnants of a staircase of brick and mortar which represents probably a portion of the site of the royal palace. The water tower near Sādatullah Khān's Mosque is kept

in repair and shows that such reservoirs were in use in those days.

The historic fortress comprehends the three hills and the enclosing massive fortifications arranged in the form of a triangle, the triangular space enclosed being about three miles in perimeter and forming the lower fort, the three hills constituting the citadels. The work of conservation of the fortress is therefore very large. The most important buildings in this area are situated in the two citadels of Rājagiri and Krishṇagiri respectively, and also in the lower fort at the foot of Rājagiri. They comprise a number of large granaries and tanks, pavilions, palaces, barracks, temples and mosques, the best of which, including the Arcot Gate, the Pondicherry Gate and the Royal Battery constructed by the French, have now been repaired.

One of the most important buildings of archæological interest is the Venṅkataramaṇa-swāmi temple. The *mantapa* and the compound wall of this structure, both of which had been badly damaged, have been put in safe condition and protected from the leakage of rain water. The roof of the temple has been made water-tight. The parapets of the ramparts and those around the Pondicherry Gate-way have been built up with new brick-

work where necessary and the roads throughout the fort are maintained in good order. The over-hanging terrace of the Īswaran Kōil has been secured by the support of a buttress. The outer fort wall has also been repaired in several places.

The place had long been the scene of malaria's virulent scourge. As early as 1760, soon after its capture from French hands by the English, Governor Pigot of Madras wrote to the French general at Pondicherry and observed that "the prisoners could be sent to Gingee, a place to which nothing could tempt a state to doom any of its subjects, but the great advantages resulting from its situation and strength—a place whose pernicious air and water plunge into irrevocable sickness and pain almost all whom necessity compels to inhabit it for a time. That is the place you have chosen for your prisoners who would suffer there a lingering death."*

* A peculiar feature of both sides in the Carnatic Wars was their habit of treating prisoners as men that ought to be, strictly speaking, fed by the side to which they naturally belonged; and we find that Nawab Muhammad Ali insisted that the French prisoners on his side should be either fed with French money or made to go hungry, 'according to European practice.' Dupleix maintained that this pernicious practice was begun by Lawrence and the English and only adopted by the French as a retaliatory measure.

Even as late as 1860 its health conditions remained notoriously bad. According to an official report of 1860, “some years previously the neighbourhood of Gingee was considered unhealthy (malarial) and became a shelter for thieves and a den for wild beasts. It remained an isolated spot dreaded by all and the fort and buildings became a prey to any one who coveted the valuable store of finely worked ornamental stones.” Gingee had long enjoyed the reputation of being an unhealthy locality. The Muhammadans transferred their headquarters of the Carnatic subah from Gingee to Arcot in 1716 A. D., due to the unhealthiness of the former town. Even during the rule of Nawab Dāūd Khan (1700—1708) the transference of the seat of administration to Arcot seems to have been planned. The French are held by Orme to have lost 1,200 European soldiers during their (less than) ten years’ occupation of Gingee. About 1850 a suggestion was made to convert Gingee into a depot for the storage of salt as it conveniently lay between Marakkāṇam, Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and other places.

The Origin of the name Gingee

The Tamil name Śeṇji with the popular appellation of Gingee has been variously derived. It is supposed to have had its origin

from Saṅjīvi, the famous panacea of Hindu mythology; it has been explained as the combination of two roots, *saṁ* (pleasure) and *jī* (giving); the name has also been traced to Śingavaram, a neighbouring Vāishṇava shrine, whose god is supposed to be the guardian deity of the place.** Local tradition has however another explanation to offer. The legend runs that seven virgin sisters who once lived here—one of them being Senjiamman—were threatened with a violation of their chastity; and though rescued from danger by a valiant man named *Thadikāra Virappan*, they could not survive the insult offered to them and so committed suicide. Their spirits are even now believed to be haunting the place and considered the *genii loci*. Each of them has got her own little shrine still existing and attracts votaries from the neighbourhood. It is very probable that Senjiamman who is worshipped on one of the heights, gave her name to the particular hill and this afterwards came to be the common designation of the whole circle of hills and the village below. Another of the sisters, *Kamalakāṇṇiamman*, has a shrine dedicated to her at the base of the shooting scarp on Rājagiri which, on certain days in the year, is thronged with worshippers. It was original-

** Garstin's '*District Manual of South Arcot*', p. 411.

ly known after the goddess as Kamalagiri, a circumstance that adds to the probability of the popular version of the derivation of the name.

According to accepted tradition embodied in the *Karnātaka Rājākkal Savistāra Chari-tam* of Narayana Kōn, written in the early years of the nineteenth century and forming a very important item in the historical portion of the Mackenzie Manuscripts lodged with the Madras Government, Gingee had an earlier name known as Krishṇāpura. This name was possibly given to it by its first ruling dynasty, who were of the shepherd class and whose tutelary deity was the Lord Sri Krishṇa; or it might have received that name under its powerful ruler, Krishṇappa Nayak.

The Bijapur authorities who held the fort from about 1660 to 1677 called it Bādshā-bād, while the Marathas who succeeded them called it Chandry or Chindy. The Mughals, on their capture of the fort in 1698 after a long siege, named it Nasrat Gaddah in honour of Nawab Zulfiqār Khān Nasrat Jang, the commander-in-chief of the besieging army. Later, the English and the French called it Gingee or Jinji. The early Madras records give the spelling Chingee or Chengey. Whatever might be the name by which it might

have been known in different epochs, it has retained the name Gingee, the English form of the Tamil word, Śenji.*

Garstin identified Gingee with Śingavaram where there is a rock-cut pagoda on a hill, and which is situated 2½ miles west of Gingee. Śingavaram ought to have been included in Gingee according to the description of the different fortifications and their area.**

* According to the *Madras University Tamil Lexicon*, Vol. III, p. 1582, Gingee is thus explained, merely giving information taken from the *District Gazetteer of South Arcot*:—cenci, n. perh. Śṛṅgin. Ginji, a hill fortress of historical interest in South Arcot district;

The suggested derivation from Sanskrit Śhrīṅgi is given in the *Madras Manual of Administration* Vol. III, *Glossary*, p. 393; and the Tamil Shīṅgi from which, after two or three stages of phonetic transformation, the present name is held to be derived was a corruption from the Sanskrit term. The Tamil word Chīṅgi means poison and not a fortress, lead monoxide and the gall-nut and also a fresh water fish; it is also the corruption of Simhi, the mother of Rahu, the ascending node; the feminine form of Singan, meaning a woman of fowler tribe. These explanations cannot give here any appropriate meaning at all.

** The following is held to be the derivation of Gingee from Singavaram. Gingee might have been derived from Āṅga its original name, Varam the suffix added to Āṅga, generally denoting the place or town like the suffix puram. The above derivation, though it may seem very far-fetched, is given below.

Various phonetic changes should have come about before Singavaram could have become Gingee.

The initial surd 'C' in Āṅga had given place to its sonant (J or G) and becomes (Jīṅga or Gīṅga). Again

Though the fort had been in existence even in the 14th century in the times of the Vijayanagara rulers, Kumāra Kampana and his Brahman general Gōpanārya, according to current tradition, the pagoda at Śiṅgavaram was built only by Tupakāla Krishnappa Nayak (or Tubāki Krishnappa Nayak) who added largely to the main fort of Gingee.*

the medial Sonant (J or G) in Ġinga or Ġinga changes into (J) which is a common feature of the English language; for instance, in the English word for Ganges for we find this tendency at work. G changes into J. Now accordingly we get Ġinga or Ġinga. Another influence of a phonetic law inherent in all the languages works. By the law of progressive assimilation we find vowel i in Ġinga, influences the final vowel a and converts it into i; and we get Ġingi or Ġingee in its present form.

* 'There lived at Conjeevaram a very devout worshipper of Vishnu called Tupakāla Kistnappa Nayak, who possessed a flower-garden which he dedicated to the use of Varadarajaswami, the famous idol worshipped at that place, and of which he scrupulously offered every flower at the shrine. One day, the Swami, with a view to put his worshipper's faith to the test, appeared in the garden in the shape of a boar and began to root up the shrubs. Tidings of the occurrence being brought to Kistnappa Nayak, he armed himself with a bow with the intention of killing the animal which, however, always evaded the arrows shot at it, while still leading the Nayak on, until they arrived at the rock where the pagoda now stands (about 45 miles from Conjeevaram) when, being satisfied with the faithfulness of his follower, the Swami suddenly made a cavern in the rock, and assuming his real shape, discovered himself to the Nayak, who prostrated himself and was ordered by the Swami to build a temple on the spot, and to dedicate it to him. He asked where he was to get the necessary funds from, and was ordered to wait upon a Paradēsi, or asce-

tic who lived in the hills, close by. This he did. The ascetic was in possession of a wonderful plant which had all the properties of the philosopher's stone. It only required to boil a quantity of the leaves in a large cauldron, and to throw in a holy person, when his body would turn into gold. On the Nayak's appearance the *Paradēsi* determined to sacrifice him and made his preparations accordingly; but the Nayak being suspicious of the *Paradēsi*'s intentions, threw him into the cauldron and watched his body turn into solid gold. He cut off a golden limb, and the next day found it had grown again. With this inexhaustible treasure at his disposal, the Nayak built the Śingavaram pagoda and subsequently the fort of Gingee, and then flung the golden corpse into a corner of the Chettikulam (a tank inside the fort of Gingee) where it is still said to remain."

We have a Tubāki Krishnappa Nāyaka of Gingee flourishing about the middle of the 17th century.

CHAPTER II

The Beginnings of Gingee

Gingee had not developed into a place of note in the age of the Cholas of the Vijayālaya dynasty. We have, however, a large number of Chola epigraphs scattered in the neighbourhood of the place. An inscription of Āditya I refers to Śingapuranādu, which evidently centred round Śingavaram. The Cholas had control over the present South Arcot District and the province of Jayangonda Chola Mandalam, named after Rajendra Chola I, included the region of Gingee and extended from the Palar river on the north to Tiruvati (near Panruti), fourteen miles west of Cuddalore. There is a village of the name Jayangondān, situated about two miles from Gingee. Dēvanūr is another village of the neighbourhood, said to have been founded by a Chola chief, Bhulōka Dēvēndran.

In the epoch of the disruption of the Chola empire in the 13th century consequent on the encroachments of the Pandyas, the Hoysalas and the Kākatiyas and on the increasing turbulence of the feudatories, Gingee might have become a fortified place.

The chief source for the first two hundred years of the history of the place, besides a

few epigraphs, is the "Complete History of the Carnatic Kings" (*Karnātaka Rājākkal Savistāra Charitram*) found among the *Mackenzie Manuscripts*. It was compiled, after a consultation of numerous authorities, both Hindu and Muhammadan, by one Narayanan who claimed to be a descendant of the Ananda Kōn clan of Gingee.*

* "*Carnātaca rājākal savistara charitram*, or a general history of the Indian Peninsula. Old No. 214, C. M. 75.

"This work, which is of no ordinary interest or importance, professes to be a general history of Peninsular India; *Mahomedan* as well as *Hindu*; and to include the period from the commencement of *Cali yuga*, corresponding with the installation of *Paricshita*, son of *Abimanya*, and grandson or *Arjuna*, down to *Cali yuga* 4908, being *Acheya* year of the Hindu cycle; era of *Vikramaditya* 1864—*Salivahana saka* 1729 (A. D. 1807-8). It is a great pity that there is a small chasm in one place; and a much larger one in another; though not in the most valuable portions." As analysed and described by the Rev. W. Taylor (pp. 34-41 of Vol. III of his *Catalogue Raisonné*).

"*Introduction*.—The usual invocation. The author's name, *Nārayen* of the *Anantakon* race of Ginjee. The book was composed while Lord W. Bentinck was Governor of Madras, at the special request of Colonel William Macleod, the Commissioner at Arcot, who desired *Narayanan* to write down a narrative of events in India from the earliest times; as such an account would be very acceptable to Europeans. In consequence of this request, *Nārayanen* felt great anxiety that his work should be complete and authentic; and after six months' preparatory study, during which he specially procured the aid of learned Mahomedans and acquired from them all the details of their books and records, he wrote down this compendium of results. He offers the customary apology to authors and critics, for any deficiency that may be found in his production."

“The first *Cānda*, or section, on primeval matters....

The second *Cānda*, or section, relating to the royal line of *Hastināpuri*.....

The third *Cānda*, or section, account of the *Willuet*, or original country of the Mahomedans; Geographical details and definitions of the country north west of the *Indus* adapted to aid in fixing the reference of names in *Pauranic* geography.....

Section 4th. On *Dəlhi* affairs.....

Section 5th. Account of *Timur*.....

Section 6th. Concerning the *Mahrattas* and the *Tuluva* country.

Section 7th. On the *Hassan* dynasty of the *Deccan* kingdom.

Section 8th. Concerning the lower *Carnataka* country.

Definite boundaries of the Carnatic. The *Tondamandalam*, capital *Conjeevaram*; the *Canara* country, capital *Seringapatnam*; the *Cholamandalam*, capital here said to be *Chenji* (Ginjee); *Chola dēsam* on the *Cauvery*, its capital *Tanjore*; to the south, *Pandiya mandalam*, capital *Madura* with *Trichinopoly*; *Chera mandalam*, capital *Tirunagiri*; *Kerala desam*, capital *Ananta sayanam*; *Telinga desam*, capital *Kolacondai* (Golconda).....”

W. Taylor makes the following remark on this manuscript:—“In a general retrospect of the contents of this large manuscript, it appears that the suggestion of an English gentleman produced that rare result, a native Hindu historian; writing under the influence of good sense, and in conformity, to a prevailing degree, with European notions of history. In an abstract, I have not felt myself obliged to verify, or compare his dates and facts with other authorities. There are probably some anachronisms and errors; but the value of the whole seems to me considerable; and the eighth section (concerning the Lower *Karnataka* country), down to the arrival of the English, invaluable. To me, that matter is new; and, with the incidental coincidences derivable from other papers in this collection, a narrative may now be carried upwards, with some degree of certainty, to the era of *Krishna rayer*; about which time there is only a

The narrative was written at the special request of Colonel William Macleod who was then acting as Commissioner at Arcot, the Madras Governor at that time being Lord

short interval of anarchy till we reach the regular *Chola* government. The whole manuscript, but especially the first half of the eighth section, ought, I am of opinion, to be carefully translated and edited."

On a later examination of Section 8, W. Taylor makes the following further observation:—

"I then noticed more critically, than on the first occasion, how very crude was the language and spelling of words; more like a Mahomedan writing Tamil, than a Tamil-speaking man of noble descent. The barbarism of *Kodan Tamerh* (vulgar Tamil) is so great, as sometimes to cause obscurity, as to the meaning. There once existed another abridged copy on palm leaves. Should it be ever recovered, it might be of use to compare with the larger book; and a general correction of the orthography throughout would produce a book well worth printing, with a translation on the opposite pages, so as to form a diglott."

Mr. Taylor remarks that in the 8th section there were very many "details of intrigues, perfidies and consequent wars, long before any Europeans intermeddled with the politics of the peninsula. Just as similar things prepared the way in Bengal, for a grand change of rule, so it was in the peninsula. With these, Orme was not so well acquainted, as with the early affairs in Bengal."

There was published in 1939 at Pondicherry—under the auspices of the Société de l'Histoire de l'Inde Française—a French translation of the 8th section, on the basis of a copy obtained from The India Office Collection, entitled *Histoire Détaillée des Rois du Carnatic*—par Narayanampoullé, traduite du tamoul et annotée par Gnanou Diagou, avocat. (Bibliothèque Publique, Rue des Capucins, Pondicherry—pp. 224)—An English translation of the same mss. is now being prepared by the author.

William Bentinck. The book is fairly valuable, so far as such crude annals can be, in many historical details and is marked by an absence of exaggeration which is the bane of all early Indian chroniclers.

According to Narayanan, Gingee became a fortified place only about 1,200 A. D. Ananda Kōn, a shepherd by caste, accidentally found a treasure in one of the cavities of the western hill while grazing his sheep. Making himself the head of a small band of warriors, he defeated the petty rulers of the neighbouring villages like Dēvanūr, Jayangondān and Mēlachēri (Old Gingee), and built a small fortress on *Kamalagiri* which he renamed *Anandagiri* after himself. He raised his castemen to high places and bestowed on them the distinction of *Sammānamānār* (the honorable).*

Ananda Kōn fortified Perumukkal** near Tindivanam which was the scene of

* Anantakon gave to his tribe the name of *Sammānamānār*. He was succeeded by *Crishnakon*, Fusly 650; *Gonerikon*, Fusly 680; both of them built sacred edifices. His son was *Govindakon*, Fusly 700; *Palliyakon*, Fusly 720, he made roads, choultries, &c. The dynasty now gave way before a *Curumba* tribe, named *Vadaga Yediar* (north-country shepherds); the first king of this tribe was *Kobi lingam*, Fusly 740; he built a brick fort at *Chentamangalam* (Sēdamangalam); he formed some tanks, and left others unfinished.

** "Permacoil", as it is called by Orme, but really "Perumukkal" (signifying, great travail) is an isolated

some operations in the Carnatic wars of the eighteenth century and Padaivīdu*** near Pōlūr in North Arcot. After reigning gloriously for about fifty years he was succeeded by one Krishna Kōn about 1240 A. D. This chief perpetuated his name by fortifying the northern hill and naming it after himself. Krishna Kōn was followed by two princes successively Kōnēri Kōn and Gōvinda Kōn who cut out the elaborate steps to the fortress on Krishnagiri and built the Gōpālaswāmi temple on its top. Puliya Kōn succeeded him about 1300 A. D. He excavated tanks and built rest-houses by the sides of the roads leading to Trichinopoly, Tanjore

rock rising out of the plain about 6 miles east of Tindivanam. Its name is said to be derived from the legend which attaches to it of Sita, the wife of Rāma, having been delivered there of twins (Kuşa and Lava) during her banishment by Rāma, after her return from Lanka. It was a strongly fortified post during the 18th century and was captured and re-captured by the French and the English on several occasions. During the advance against Pondicherry, in 1760, Sir Eyre Coote captured it after a desperate fight, in which he received a wound, and the leader of the sepoys behaved with such conspicuous gallantry that he got a gold medal. There are a few ruins here and there which suffice to show where the fortifications stood.

*** Padaivīdu. This desolated place is one of the most historically interesting in the North Arcot district. Though it now contains only less than 1,000 inhabitants, Tradition says that it was the capital of a dynasty, which many hundreds or thousands of years ago held sway in this part of the country. This no doubt refers to the Kurumbas. The town was 16 miles in circumference,

and Vēttavalam (a small zamindari in the neighbourhood.)¹

and full of temples, choultries, and fine private residences. The extent of the city may be judged by the fact that the present villages of Santavāsal, where the fair or *santa* was held, and Pushpagiri, the site of the flower-market, are 4 miles apart. The city is believed to have been entombed by a shower of dust and stones, which overwhelmed all the area of its magnificent buildings. Jungle has overgrown the whole space of the original city. There are two extensive, but ruined, forts upon the plain, built doubtless by the Kurumbas, and another upon a peak of the Javadi hills which overlooks the city. There are at the place two temples dedicated to Rēṇukāmbāl and Rama.

¹ Succession of the Gingee kings of the Kōn Dynasty:—

Ananta (1190 to 1240 A. D.); Krishna (1240 to 1270 A. D.); Gōvinda (1290 to 1310 A. D.); and Puliyan (1310 to 1330 A. D.) The dates are given in the Chronicle in Fasli years.

“The Fasli is used solely by Hindu clerks in the East India Company’s service. During the Musulman government the Fasly was loosely used; thus the year Krodhi (A. D. 1784) is Fasli 1193, but in some documents is 1194. The year Saumya (A. D. 1789) is numbered Fasli 1198; but in some places this becomes 1196, and elsewhere 1199.

“About the year A. D. 1800 when the county became subject to the English, the Fasly year happened to commence on the 13th of July. Whereupon the English constituted that day as the beginning of the Fasly year; which hereby was metamorphosed into a solar reckoning: but devoid of months: being a mere official year. The Hindus at the present day (only the clerks in Government employ) quote the Fasly by the last two figures alone. Thus A. D. 1820 is called “Fasly Twenty-nine” (A. F. 1229); which it is the fashion to mention in Hindustani numerals; thus “Untis Fasly” means 1229. And Fasly 1239 (A. D. 1830) is called Untalis Fasly: that is 1239.

Twenty years afterwards, this shepherd race was superseded by the chief of a neighbouring place, Kōbilingan by name, who belonged to the Kurumba caste and now ascended the throne of Gingee. He built a brick-fort at Sēndamangalam in the taluk of Tirukoyilur, dug some tanks, left others which he began in an unfinished condition and cut out various channels for irrigation purposes, some of which are believed to exist even to-day. He had a large number of feudatories who acknowledged his suzerainty; and some of them had fortresses at Aśuppūr, Pelakuppur, Kuppam and other places. It was this Kōbilingan that fell a prey to the ambition of Vijayanagar; but it is not definitely known when and by which general the conquest was achieved. The loss of independence of the fort did not lead, however, to any diminution in its importance.

Thus the dynasty of the Kōns gave way to the Kurumbars whose ruler Kōbilingan (perhaps connected with Kōpperunjinga)* is

“Thus in Munro's Report (26th July 1807, Fifth Report, p. 785) he speaks of the Survey rent in 1215 (meaning Fasly 1215, that is, A. D. 1806); and 1217 and 1218, meaning A. D. 1808 and 1809.”—C. P. Brown—*An Ephemeris* showing the corresponding dates according to the English, Hindu and Musalman Calendars from A. D. 1751 until 1850 (1850—pp. IV-V.)

* This Kōpperunjinga was a chief of the family of Kāḍavarāyas, who, according to recent research, is re-

said to have built a fort at Śēdamangalam in the neighbourhood. This latter place was the head-quarters of the powerful Chola feudatory, Kōpperunjinga. With the rise of the Vijayanagara empire and its absorption of the greater part of South India, unity of control and administration spread throughout the country; and Gingee, like the other principalities of Madura and Tanjore, was brought under its wide sovereignty. The subjugation of Gingee by the Vijayanagara power about the close of the 14th century is referred to in the Mackenzie Mss. which say that Gingee submitted to Narasinga Raya, who held it as a fief of Vijayanagara sending an annual tribute.

garded as having flourished in some degree of glory and power in the years 1229 to 1278. He attempted, with some measure of success, to establish the power and prestige of his family in the region of the present South Arcot district by taking an intensive and creditable part in the triangular struggle for dominance then going on between the Pāndyas, the Hoysalas and the Kākatiyas. He became an independent ruler in the year 1243 and counted his regnal years from that date. He was the able co-adjutor of Sundara Pandya I, whose progress in Tondamandalam was rendered possible largely by his assistance and co-operation. His inscriptions are found largely in the South Arcot, North Arcot and Chingleput districts and to a less extent in the Tanjore and Kurnool districts. He assumed many titles like *Pāndyamandalasthāpanā-sūtradhāra*, *Sahōdara-sundara*, *Karnāṭaka-Lakshmī-luntaka*, *Kāthaka lanka-tilaka*, *Pennānadhīnātha*, *Sarvagna*, *Kadgamalla*, *Vāḷbalapperumāl*, *Kanakasabhā-pathisabha*, *sarvakārya-sarvakāla-nirvāhaka* and *Kāvēri-Kāmuka*. His titles included the name of *Alagijāsīyan*.

The Kurumbars

According to the Mackenzie Mss. the Tondamandalam country was inhabited by wild forest tribes, who had no culture.

and the epithets of *Kavisārvabhauma* and *Sāhityaratnākara*.

A theory of two Kōpperrunjingas, father and son, bearing the same name, has also been put forward; and also different versions are held of his relations with the Pandyas and of his other acts like the imprisonment of the Chola ruler, Rajendra III. The Kādavarāyas became powerful in the South Arcot District and contributed largely to the dismemberment of the Chola empire during the 13th and the early part of the 14th centuries. They had for their capital Kūdal i.e., Cuddalore which is at the junction of two rivers, the Gadilam and the South Pennar) and later at Sēndamangalam which is in the interior in the Tirukkoyilur taluk. The Kādavarāyas claimed kinship with the Pallavas. That Kōpperunjinga who ruled or revived his rule from 1242 to 1278 A. D., should be regarded as a really great personage. The chief Kādavaraya ruler had several subordinate chiefs under him. (Refer to (1) K. A. N. Sastri: *The Colas*, Vol. 2, part I, pp, 180-4 *et seq*; (2) the Kādavarāya Problem by Mr. R. Satyanatha Aiyar in the *Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume*; (3) the Kadavarayas by Mr. V. Vridhagirisan in the *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XVI, 1937, pp. 137-160; (4) The Madras Epigraphist's Reports 1922 and 1923; (5) The Kādavarayas by S. Somasundara Desikar in the *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XVII. Part 3.

Perhaps the Kōbinlingan of our chronicle was of the early 14th century. The chronicle says that he ruled about Fasli 740. Anyway the last Kōns finished their rule after Fasli 720, i.e. 1331 A. D. which is much later, nearly half a century after the death of the great Kōpperunjinga of the epigraphs. Perhaps, this Kōbinlingan belonged to the clan of the Kādavarāyas and distinguished himself by his particular achievements in Gingee and its neighbourhood.

Men were then naked savages with no regular marriage institutions.

Out of such forest tribes arose men who, though first ignorant of civilisation, in course of time evolved a rude organisation and agreed to abide by the decision of one among themselves whom they made their chief. Probably, Kōbilingan who is referred to as the first Kurumba chief, was the one who was followed by the Vijayanagara rulers. This chief has been credited with having divided the region into administrative divisions, with fortified strong-holds, Pulal in Pulalkōttam, being his head-quarters which was situated near the modern Red Hills Lake adjoining Madras. The Tondamandalam country was named after them as Kurumba Bhūmi. Afterwards the Kurumba Bhūmi was held to have been invaded by the Chola, Āondai-Chakravarthi. The Kurumbar then formed the ruling class. The ruins of their forts are supposed to be still visible and some very old walls of these near Madras are mentioned. The fort destroyed by Krishna Deva Raya at Marutam near Conjeevaram in the Uttaramērur area was, according to legend, built by the Kurumbar, covering more than 40 acres of land with two boundary walls.

Linschoten says in (*Purchas*: Vol. X) “that the Canarins and the Corumbins are the countrymen, dealing with land, fishing, and such like labours. They are, in a manner, of dark brown colour, their dwelling places being on the sea side. Some of these Kurumbars became the ruling classes, while others lived by other means like the rearing of sheep and goats, which was their main occupation.” According to the Mackenzie Mss., they made blankets out of goats’ hair and sold them. Some others among them made and sold *chunam*, and some were hunters who lived by the chase.

The Kurubas or Kurumbas are generally regarded by ethnologists and other writers as being composed of two distinct groups, namely the Jungle Kurumbas of the Nilgiris and other hilly regions, and the civilised Kurumbas of the plains. Dr. G. Oppert would regard the Kurumbas as very old inhabitants forming the indigenes of the land who can contest with their Dravidian kinsmen the priority of occupation of the Indian soil. He would also say that the terms, Kurumba and Kuruba, were originally identical. The *Madras Census Report* for 1891 thus first postulated their widespread character: “The Kurumbas or Kurrubas are the modern representatives of the ancient Kurumbas or Pallavas, who were

once so powerful throughout Southern India ; but very little trace of their greatness now remains. In the seventh century, the power of the Pallava kings seems to have been at its zenith ; but, shortly after this, the Kongu, Chola, and Chalukya chiefs succeeded in winning several victories over them. The final overthrow of the Kurumba sovereignty was effected by the Chola King Âdoṇḍai about the seventh or eighth century A. D. ; and the Kurumbas were scattered far and wide. Many fled to the hills ; and in the Nilgiris and the Wynad, in Coorg and Mysore, representatives of this ancient race are now found as wild and uncivilised tribes. Elsewhere the Kurumbas are more advanced, and are usually shepherds, and weavers of coarse woollen blankets.”

The name Kuruba is said to be a derivative of the Canarese root, *kuru*, sheep (cf. Tamil *kōri*) ; but it has been contended that the Kurumbas were not originally a purely shepherd tribe, and it has been held that the particular kind of sheep called *kōri* is so called because it is the sheep of the Kurumbas. Again, the ancient lexicographer of the Tamil language, Piṅgala Muni, defines the Kurumbar as Kurunila Mannar, or petty chieftains. But the most common derivation is from the Tamil *kurumbu*, =(wickedness), so that

Kurumban means a wicked man.* With this may be compared the derivation of Kaḷḷan from *kalavu*,=(theft); and 'the Kaḷḷans were generally believed to have been closely connected, if not identical, with the original Kurumbas. On the other hand, the true derivation may be in the other direction, as in the case of the Slavs.

After their final overthrow, they became scattered over many of the districts in the plains and the forest tracts of Malabar, the Nilgiris, Coimbatore and Mysore. They are found at the present time in various grades of civilisation. Those that live in the plains have adopted the manners and customs of the Hindu castes in whose midst they live, while those that inhabit the hills are still in their primitive state, being more akin in habits to the rude hill-folk surrounding them.

The assumption that the Kurubas who are found in towns and villages are of the same stock as the uncivilized jungle tribes, the Kādu-Kurubas, is, notwithstanding the traditionally accepted version, highly doubtful. In customs, beliefs and other vital matters, the two communities differ from each other very much. This pretension to a descent

* See *The Tamil Lexicon* (University of Madras)—Vol. II, 1 p. 1055-6.

from a ruling race is not advanced anywhere as far as this enquiry has proceeded; only some say that they came to Mysore first from Vijayanagar and that their original place is Mailara in the Bellary district. Quite possibly the so-called Kādu-Kurubas are the locally surviving representatives in Southern India of the primitive aborigines.

After Fasli 800, according to the Chronicle, Narasinga Udayār is said to have become the viceroy of Gingee; and the Maharaya of Anegundi, Vijayanagaram and Penukonda, sent an army against the aforesaid Kōbilingan; and having conquered his country, the Maharaya delivered it over to Narasinga Udayār, to be held as a fief paying tribute to head-quarters; at the same time a donation was made to a temple. Also, about this time, the Raja of Wandiwash, named Bhūpatirāya Udayār, ruled over the land (*Saka* 1341=1419); and Viravijaya Rayar was also another ruler in the district. Even before these lieutenants had left Vijayanagara, Vellālaraya is said to have ruled over the Gingee country about Fasli 750 and to have made additions to the shrine at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai. He paid tribute to the Raya; and after he fell, the country came to be divided among petty chiefs.

This is the gist of the information contained in the chronicle regarding the troubled period between the disappearance of the Kōn dynasty and the establishment of the overlordship of Vijayanagara. Inconsistencies, both chronological and sequential, occur several times in this account. Vellālaraya evidently refers to Ballala III, Vīra Ballala of the Hoysala dynasty, (1291 to 1342 A. D.) and perhaps also to his son Ballala IV, surnamed Vīravirūpāksha Ballala, *alias* H a m p ē y a Wodeyār, who disappeared in 1346—47. The Hoysalas had been steadily encroaching into the lower Karnataka country from about the early decades of the 13th century. Narasimha II (1220-1235 A. D.) occupied Kāñchi, the old Pallava capital; and a record of 1229 A. D. says that he was ruling from Kāñchi with the surrounding ocean as his boundary. A previous record of 1223 A. D. states that Narasimha, “pursuing after the Trikalinga kings, penetrated their train of elephants, displaying unequalled valour.” This probably refers to his driving out of Kāñchi, some years before he occupied it, the Telugu-Chola chief Tikka, who also claims to have been a *Chōla-sthāpanāchārya*.

The next Hoysala sovereign, Vīrasōmēs-wara (1234 to 1254 A. D.), claims to have uprooted in battle Rājendra Chola III and, later,

to have given him protection when he sought refuge and to have engaged in a victorious expedition against the Kādavarāya.* Sōmēsvara pushed on his conquest into the Pandya territory against its aggressive ruler. One of his capitals was Kaṇṇanūr or Vikramapura to the north of Srirangam in the Trichinopoly district. At this place, there is a ruined fort containing a temple known as Poyśalēsvara, whose image was set up by Sōmēsvara. On the death of Sōmēsvara there was a division of his kingdom between his two sons, Vīranarasimha or Narasimha III who got the greater part of the ancestral kingdom and ruled from Dōrasamudra as his capital and his half-brother Ramanatha or Vīra Ramanatha who got the Kolar district and the Tamil territories conquered by Narasimha and who ruled from Kaṇṇanūr as his capital. The two brothers were not at peace with each other and much of the time of Narasimha III was spent in fighting against Ramanatha who was frequently the aggressor. Ramanatha ruled from 1255 to 1295 A. D.;

* *Epig. Carnatica* Vol. V : A. K., 123; and S. I. Epigraphist's Report, 1911—p. 33. The Hoysala records say that Vīra Sōmēsvara 'uprooted' Rājendra Chola in battle and reinstated him when he begged for protection. For a fuller discussion of this see K. A. Nilakanta Sastri: *The Colas*; Vol. II (1937)—pp. 198—199 and footnote 75 on p. 199; and S. K. Aiyangar. *South India and her Muhammadan Invaders* (1921)—p. 38.

and after his time there was the short-lived rule of his son, Visvanatha. Ballala III, the son of Vira Narasimha, succeeded his father in 1292 and became the sole ruler of the entire Hoysala kingdom, including the Tamil districts, about the year 1298. It was in his reign that the Hoysala power began rapidly to decline. He lost the southern portions of the Tamil country originally subject to him, but practically retained the control of the whole of Kongu. About the time of the death of Ballala III, Harihara, the founder of the Vijayanagara dynasty, was already established in some measure of power. A chief named Vallappa Danda Nāyakar, who frequently figures in the later records of Ballala III, was probably the *aliya* or son-in-law, Vallappar, a Mahāmaṇḍalēsvara under Harihara I.

This Vallappa was perhaps the same as Veḷḷaḷaraya of the tradition in the Chronicle; he is said to have ruled over the Gingee country about Fasli 750 (*i.e.*, about 1341 A. D.) and to have made additions to the shrine at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and to have paid tribute to the Raya. Still another feudatory of the Hoysala was Gōpinātha, a descendant of the famous Perumāḷ Dandanāyaka who described himself as the lord of the South. This attempted identification is supported by the traditional

story relating to the final destruction of the Hoysalas under Ballala IV. Vallappa Udaiyār, the *aliya* or son-in-law of Ballala III should be very likely the Śenji Raja married to the King Ballala IV's sister.*

Ballala IV had to fight continuously with the various feudatory chiefs of his kingdom and the powerful Sultans of Madura who had built up their independent rule; and the latter had indeed secured a victory over Ballala III near Kaṇṇanūr, where the Hindus were put to flight and the aged Hoysala

* The story is thus given in the *Mysore Gazetteer*, new edition, Volume II, part II, page 1406 :—'The king's sister, married to the Senjiraja, was now a widow. She therefore came on a visit to her brother, accompanied by her two sons, Lakkana and Virana, who were very handsome young men. One of the king's wives conceived a guilty passion for them, but her advances being alike repelled by each in turn, her love changed to hate, and she denounced them to the king as having made overtures to her. The king, justly enraged, ordered them to be at once impaled, and their bodies exposed like those of common malefactors at one of the city gates. Hearing what had happened, their unfortunate mother hastened to the palace to demand an inquiry and justice. But it was too late, the fatal order had been executed, and she was not only put out of the palace, but the inhabitants were forbidden to give her any assistance. In the agony of despair she wandered from street to street invoking the vengeance of the Almighty on her brother, and predicting the speedy downfall of his empire. Arriving at the potters' street, worn out with fatigue and sorrow, she requested and received a draught of water in return for which act of kindness, she declared that in the destruction of the capital that street should be spared. It is the only one that has survived.'

monarch himself was captured, strangled and flayed, the stuffed skin being hung on the walls of Madura where the Moorish traveller, Ibn Battuta, says that he saw it suspended at the time of his visit to the place.* “Thus did the great struggle of the Hoysala monarch end (A. D. 1342-3). This monarch had been striving all along, rebuilding his capital and fortifying places of strategic importance on the eastern frontier like Kaṇṇanūr and Tiruvaṇṇāmalai.¹ Evidence has also been forthcoming that he laid the foundations of the city of Virūpākshapattana, in order to strengthen his northern frontier, and was actually in residence there in A. D. 1339. He had his son anointed as his successor against eventualities; and an inscription of Maḷūr² would credit him with the setting up of a pillar of victory at the head of the bridge at Rāmēswaram (*Sētumūla jayastambha*). It is possible that Kaṇṇanūr had become the target of active attacks by the Muhammadans of Madura against the Hoysala defence of the Tamil country; and we find Vīra Ballāla frequently fighting near Trichinopoly; and the Kabbān of Ibn Battuta is held to be no other

* H. A. R. Gibb-*Ibn Battuta-Travels in Asia and Africa*, (Broadway Travellers. 1929) p. 264.

¹ *Epigraphia Carnatica*; III. Md. 100.

² *Ibid.* Vol. X. Mr. 82.

than Kaṇṇanūr near which his last battle was fought. Soon after this, Ballala IV, already anointed ruler, succeeded to the dangerous heritage and kept it up till his eventual disappearance in A. D. 1346-47 after which no more of the Hoysalas is heard.³

Thus the Gingee country was under the rule of the Hoysalas in the latter part of the 13th century and in the first half of the 14th. From the Hoysalas it passed on, by relatively easy efforts, into the hands of the first rulers of Vijayanagara. The governorship of Gōpanārya (who has been already mentioned above) over the region, and his able efforts at seconding the conquests of Kamparāya have to be noted. The Vijayanagara Empire had extended its authority over the Tamil country even beyond Madura by the end of the 14th century. It exercised dominion through local governors who were practically free to do as they liked, provided they rendered fealty to the central power and supplied it with regular tribute and contingents whenever called upon to do so. The more important among these governors developed, in the 15th century, into formidable territorial rulers. Sāluva

³ For a detailed study of this aspect of the question relating to the Muhammadans of Madura and the Hoysalas, read B. N. Saletore, 'Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire'; Vol. I (1934), pp. 4-18.

Narasinga was a typical provincial ruler. In the 16th century, when the limits of the empire came to be very far flung and the whole of the central power weakened even shortly after Krishna Deva Raya's time, we find some of the Nayaks emerging out as the hereditary rulers of Gingee, Tanjore and Madura. The troubled period of the 14th century under the control of governors before the establishment of the Nayaks is not known to us in detail. Kumāra Kampaṇa, son of Bukka Raya I, who was the governor of the Muḷbāgal country made conquests in the Tondamaṇḍala region with the help of Gōpa-nārya and of Sāḷuvamāṅga, the ancestor of the great governor of Chandragiri and the usurper of royal throne itself, Sāḷuva Nara-simha. This Kamparāya, otherwise named Kampaṇa Udaiyār, was the governor of the Muḷbāgal Rajya from 1356 to 1366 A. D. He is also called Kampana II, in order to distinguish him from an uncle and a brother of the same name. His exploits are described by his queen Gangādēvi in the Sanskrit work, *Virakamparāya Charitam* (published at Trivandrum in 1916).

Kampana's conquests in the south

Kampaṇa first reached Virinchipuram on the Palar river and from it attacked the

strong fortress of Rājagambhīram, in which the Sāmbuvarāya chief had taken refuge. He captured the fortress and slew his enemy in single combat, according to one set of authorities. According to other sources, he is said to have reinstated the defeated ruler on his throne. The Rājagambhīramalai referred to in the accounts, was evidently a hill-fort; and soon after its capture, Kampaṇa entered Kāñchi and set up his authority there. An inscription found at Madam in the North Arcot district, dated 1363, specifically states that Gaṇḍaraguli Māraiya Nayaka, son of Sōmaya Dandanāyaka, the Mahāpradhāni of Kampaṇa II, defeated and took captive Ven-
rumaṅkoṇḍa Sāmbuvarāya and captured Rājagambhīramalai. This chief built a gopura in the second prākāra of Tiruvagalīsvaramudaiya Mahadeva of Kuḷattūr, according to the record. Kampaṇa's own inscription at Tirupputkkuli near Kāñchi, recording his capture of the Rājagambhīrarāja, is dated *Saka* 1287, (i.e., 1365-66.) The Rājagambhīra hill has been identified with Padaivīdu in the North Arcot district. The latest record of Kampaṇa is dated *Saka* 1296 (1374 A. D.); and his son Jam-manna Udaiyār is described as governing the same provinces as his father had ruled over, in that year, i.e.; *Saka* 1296. The son made certain gifts for the merit of his deceased

father according to inscriptions dated in the same year *Saka* 1296, found at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and Eyil. Kampaṇa Udaiyār's rule was almost like that of an independent sovereign; and his reputation and power were considerable on account of his services against the Muhammadans of the South. His capital itself was, according to the *Virakamparāya Charitam*, Marakatanagara, identified with Viriṇchipuram, which was the head-quarters of a provincial governor in the period of the later Vijayanagara sovereigns. Kampaṇa Udaiyār was assisted by several able lieutenants who served him both as ministers and generals. Besides Gōpana, there was the illustrious Sōmappa, whose son Māraiya Nayaka referred to above, was the captor of the Sāmbuvarāya and of his fort Rājagambhīramalai. Another was Gōvindaraśar, who is mentioned in the *Kōyiloluhu*, a Tamil work detailing the traditional account of the endowments of the great charities done to the Srirangam shrine in the course of the centuries. Sāḷuvamangu is stated, in the *Sāḷuvābhyudaya* and the *Rāmābhyudaya*, to have been one of the officers, who accompanied Kampaṇa in his campaign against Champarāya (Sāmbuvarāya) and the Sultan of the South (*i.e.*, Madura); and it was through his intervention that Champarāya was held to have been reinstated in his domi-

nion, for he is described as Chamburāya-Sthāpanāchārya. He made notable gifts to the Brahmans of the Srirangam shrine; and perhaps on account of the services he rendered in restoring worship at the temple there, after his recapture of the place from the Muhammadans, he was also styled Srīrangasthāpanāchārya.*

Kamparāya's inscriptions are found in the Puṇyakōtīswara shrine at Little Conjeevaram, one of which says that he conferred on Parakāla Nambi certain titles and honours at Kalavai in the Arcot taluk, at Āvur in the South Arcot district and at Tiruppulivanam in the North Arcot district. Besides Kamparāya, there was another son of Bukka, by name Sāyana Udaiyar, who ruled over a part of the North Arcot, South Arcot and Tanjore districts and one of whose inscriptions, dated *Saka* 1304 (1382), has been found at Tirukkaḷākkudi in the distant Ramnad district, while another comes from Kāngayam in the Coimbatore district.

The Ālampūdi grant of Virupaksha (Grantha and Tamil) is important for our knowledge of the history of Gingee under the early Vijayanagara rulers. It is dated

* *Vīra Kamparāya Charitam*: Introd. 35. See also *Sources of Vijayanagar History*; pp. 23-28.

Saka 1305 and records that Virūpāksha I, son of Harihara II of the first Vijayanagara dynasty, granted on the Pushya Sankrānti day of *Saka* 1305, Raktākshin, the village of Ālampūndi in the Gingee taluk to certain Brahmanas as *sarvamāniam*.**

“The first and second verses of the (Ālampūndi) inscription contain invocations addressed to the Boar-incarnation of Viṣṇu and to the goddess of the Earth, respectively. The third verse refers to Bukkaraja (I), who belonged to the race of the Moon, and who was the son of Saṅgama (I), by Kamakshi. Bukka’s son was king Harihara (II), who, as in other inscriptions, is said to have performed ‘the sixteen great gifts’ (verse 4). Harihara (II) married Malladevi, who belonged to the family of Ramadeva; and their son was Virūpāksha (v. 5), who conquered the kings of Tūṇḍira, Chōla and Pandya, and the Simhaḷas and presented the booty of his wars to his father (v. 6). On the day of the Pushya-saṁkrānti of the year Raktākshin (v. 8), which

** R. Sewell - *Lists of the Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras* - Vol. I (1882) p. 207.

J. H. Garstin - *The Manual of the South Arcot District* (1878), p. 2. :

Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III, pp. 224-29, wherein the inscription is edited by V. Venkayya.

V. Rangacharya : *Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency*, Vol. I, p. 169 (1919).

corresponds to the Saka year 1305—(The Rak-tākshin year does not correspond to Saka-Samvat 1305, but to 1307 current.)—King Virūpāksha (v. 7) granted to certain unnamed Brahmanas of various gotras the village of Ālampūndi (v. 9). This village had been the object of a previous grant by Harihara (II) (v. 9) and had then received the surname Jannāmbikābdhi (v. 10). The pronouns *mama* and *maya* in lines 17 and 21 show that both Harihara's previous grant and the present donation of Virūpāksha were made at the instance of a princess who was the sister of Harihara (II) (v. 9) and, consequently the paternal aunt of Virūpāksha, and whose name must have been Jannāmbika, because, the village of Ālampūndi received the surname Jannāmbikābdhi (*i.e.*, Jannāmbikāsamudram) (*abdhi* is a more poetical synonym of *samudra*, a frequent ending of village names; hence the actual surname was probably Jannāmbikasamudram) after her own name. The description of the boundaries of the granted village is contained in lines 22 to 26. Then follow three of the customary imprecatory verses. The inscription ends with the name Sri-Harihara."

"The Ālampūndi plate would add considerably to our knowledge of the history of the first Vijayanagara dynasty, if we could be

quite sure of the genuineness of the plate. As in other inscriptions of this dynasty, the first historical person is said to have been Saṃgama (I). The Alampūndi plate is the only inscription which informs us of the name of Saṃgama's queen, viz. Kāmākshi. According to the same plate, the queen of Harihara II, was Mallādevi. The Satyamangalam plates of Devaraya II give the name of Harihara's queen as Malāmbika. As the two names Mallādevi and Malāmbika are very similar, we may, for the present, consider them as identical. The Alampūndi record adds that Mallādevi belonged to the family of Ramadeva. It is not impossible that Mallādevi was related to the Yadava king Ramachandra, who was also called Ramadeva, and who reigned from Saka-Samvat 1193 to 1230. It is from the present inscription that we first learn that Harihara II had a sister called Jannāmbika and a son called Virūpāksha, who is reported to have made extensive conquests in the south, and whom his father appears to have placed in charge of at least a portion of the South Arcot district. The date of the grant of Virūpāksha (Saka-Samvat 1305 for 1307, the Raktakshi *samvatsara*) is a few years later than the accession of Harihara II (datable between 1293 and 1301 Saka.) In referring to a previous grant of the village

of Alampūndi by Harihara II himself, the inscription implies that the latter was ruling over a portion of the modern South Arcot district even before Saka-Samvat 1307. We do not know from other sources, thāt at this time, he had already extended his dominions into that part of the country. The earliest inscriptions of Harihara II that have hitherto been discovered in the south, are dated Saka-Samvat 1315. Consequently, it is at least doubtful if the date of the Ālampūndi plate can be looked upon as genuine. If the week-day had been mentioned in the date, it could be verified by an expert, and the result of such verification would help considerably in deciding whether the grant is genuine or not. The omission of the week-day and of the names of the donees may also be urged against the genuineness of the document. The orthographical as well as the calligraphical mistakes in which this small inscription abounds, and the uncouth language and construction which, to a casual reader, render it difficult to say who its actual donor was,—Harihara, Virūpāksha, or Jannāmbika,—are other facts which may be urged against the genuineness of the plate. On the other hand, we cannot definitely pronounce the inscription to be a forgery, because the date, Saka-Samvat 1305 (for 1307), actually falls into the reign of

Harihara II, who, in verse 4, is spoken of as if he was living at the time of the grant.* In spite of the doubts which may thus be reasonably entertained as to its genuineness, the grant is interesting as the first known copper-plate inscription in Grantha characters, professing to belong to the Vijayanagara dynasty." (pp. 225—226 of the *Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India*, edited by E. Hultzsch, Vol. III, 1894-95).

**The Muhammadan Sack of Srirangam :
Its Reconsecration by Vijayanagara :
Its Connection with Singavaram**

The sack of Srirangam by Malik Kafur is deemed as having very probably occurred, since he sacked all the temples round Kandur (Kaṇṇanūr), and since Srirangam had received vast and magnificent benefactions in the preceding century, particularly from Sundara Pandya (*acc.* A. D. 1251) whose munificence is yet green in the traditions of the people.

Kumāra Kampana, son of Bukkaraya I, led expeditions into the Tamil country, the exact dates of which have not been ascertained with precision, but which certainly constituted a continuation of the Hoysala effort

* The earliest date hitherto discovered for Harihara II is Saka-Samvat 1301, and the latest 1321.

against the Mussalman power of the South. According to numismatic evidence, we have the coins of 'Adil Shah of Madura, dated A. D. 1356, of Fakhru'd-din Mubarak Shah, dated A. D. 1360, and of Alau'd-din Sikandar Shah, whose latest coin bears the date A. H. 779 (A. D. 1377—78). Dr. S. K. Ayyangar holds that the wars of Kamparāya would have to be brought in the period of the *interregnum* at Madura (A. H. 745—757) as indicated by a break in the coinage. According to the "Tamil Chronicle of the Temple of Madura" (*Maduraittalavaralāru*), compiled about A. D. 1801, the founder of the Muhammadan dynasty at Madura was Sultan Malik Nēmi, and the date of the establishment of his power was *Saka* 1256 (A. D. 1334); and after this first ruler there followed seven actual rulers, till the Hindu power was restored in A. D. 1371 by Kampaṇa Udaiyār,—“commander of the guards of the Mysore ruler from the point of view of the writer of the record in its final form”,—who was the viceroy of the Muḷbāgal Mahārājya and had all the south for his sphere of influence. According to this Chronicle, Kampaṇa had been assigned the duty of “door-keeper of the last great Hoysala king, Vira Ballāla III.” Kampaṇa conquered Tondaimandalam, took possession of the Rājagambhīra-Rājyam which was the domi-

nion of the Sāmbuvarāyans, with its fort at Padaividu, near Ārni, and not the Pandyan kingdom, as had been held ; and he completed his achievement by the conquest of Madura and by the restoration of the great temples of Srīrangam and Madura to their pristine glory. The two great enemies overrun by Kampaṇa were the Sāmbuvarāyans and the Madura Sultans. We learn from the *Kamparāya Charitam* of Gangadevi, one of the wives of Kampaṇa (a contemporary epic in Sanskrit, since published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series), that Kampaṇa started against Champa, defeated near Virinchīpuram the forces of Champarāya (Sāmbuvarāya), laid siege to the citadel of Rājagabhīram (Padaivīdu) and killed Champarāya in a duel. Kampaṇa proceeded to Kanchi and, having stationed his forces there, stayed for a season at Marakata (Virinchipuram) where a goddess appeared to him in a vision, and after describing the horrors and cruelties practised by the Turuṣkas (Muhammadans) of Madura, exhorted him to extirpate the invaders and restore the country to its ancient glory, and gave him a divine sword of extraordinary potency with which to accomplish the great mission, saying that “as by fate the rulers of the Pandya line have lost their prowess, the sage Agastya has sent this

sword, originally wielded by the Lord Siva in his fight with the Asuras, to be placed in your strong hands." Then Kampaṇa proceeded against the Sultan of Madura and killed him in battle. The significance of this epic is obvious. Since the sword of protection of the Dharma of Hindu South India had fallen away from the enfeebled hands of the degenerate Pandyas, Agastya, the culture-hero-protector of the Tamil country, had to invite the strong arm of the growing Vijayanagara power in the shape of Kampaṇa Udaiyār, so that the role of the guardian of the Tamil country and of its independence and cultural heritage had to be sustained by the rising Rayas of Vijayanagara and their chiefs and officials.

Kampaṇa was aided in this great achievement by his Brahman minister, Gōpanārya and his general Sāḷuva Mangu, the ancestor of the great Sāḷuva Narasimha who started the second dynasty of Vijayanagara and whose achievements are described in the introduction to the *Jaimini Bhāratamu of Pillalamarri Pinavirabhadra* and in the first canto of Rājānātha Dindima's *Sāḷuvābhyudāyam*. The latter work details the expeditions of Sāḷuva Mangu against the Sambuvarāya and the Sultan of Madura, and enumerates the several titles which he assumed and

which his descendants continued to bear. The achievements of Kumāra Kampaṇa are borne out by sufficient epigraphic testimony as well; his conquest of the kingdom of Rājagambhīra is clearly evidenced by a record of A. D. 1365; and another describes how he destroyed the Turuṣkas, established orderly government throughout the country and appointed chiefs or *nāyakkamārs* for the control and proper maintenance of temples.

Another equally meritorious service done by Kampaṇa was the reconsecration of the great temple of Srirangam. It had been most probably sacked by Malik Kafur. The invasion of A. D. 1327—28 ordered by Muhammad Tughlak is held to have resulted in its complete destruction. According to the *Kōyiloluhu*, a Tamil work which describes the benefactions done to the temple in the different epochs from its foundation down to the eighteenth century and portions of whose information appear to be derived from inscriptions, there is the tradition of the Mussalmans (under Malik Kafur) after having conquered Pratapa Rudra, entering Srirangam by the north gate and carrying away all the property of the temple including the image of the God, which latter was recovered by a miraculous chain of circumstances. The sack of the temple in A. D. 1327—28 is support-

ed by a date given in the *Kōyiloluhū* (Saka 1149, instead of Saka 1249—possibly an error and Akṣaya), and also by accounts embodied in the Vaishnava *Guruparampara* and the Telugu work, *Ācharya Sukti Muktvāli*. From this sack, both Piḷḷalōkācharya and the famous Vēdānta Dēśika escaped, the former going south and the latter to the Mysore country. After prolonged sufferings the survivors carried the image of the God to Tirupati from which it was taken over to Gingee by Gōpanārya and ultimately installed at Srirangam and reconsecrated. Gōpanārya was told by God Ranganatha who appeared to him in a vision to lead an invasion against the Muhammadans and to establish his image once more at Srirangam. He marched, according to Anantarya's *Prapannāmrtam*, (a work dealing with the history of Sri Vaishṇavism in South India, and the lives of its successive Acharyas,) from Tirupati to Gingee where for a time he kept the images—there were two of them—in the neighbouring rock-cut shrine of Singavaram. He then advanced south, destroyed the Muhammadan forces at Samayavaram and consecrated the images once more in the Srirangam temple, whereupon Vēdānta Dēśika returned joyfully to Srirangam, composed a verse in praise of Gōpanārya and his great achievement and had it inscribed on the walls

of the temple. The reconsecration is said to have taken place in Saka-Samvat 1293 (A. D. 1371—2).

It is the great sevices of Kampana Udaiyār, of Sāluva Mangu who is said to have helped in the reconsecration of Srirangam and made a present to it of 60,000 *madas* of gold, 1,000 *sālagramas* and eight villages to represent the eight letters of the *Ashtākṣara*, and of Gōpanārya, praised by Vēdānta Dēsika, that constituted the consummation of the successful Hindu reaction against Muslim sway in the Tamil country. The reconsecration of Srirangam and Madura, was the restoration of Hindu glory and South Indian independence.*

* The political and cultural significance of the restoration of these great shrines by Kampana, Sāluva Mangu and Gōpanārya, should be fully evaluated at its true worth. It was only after this achievement that cleared the country of the last vestiges of Muslim sway and removed all chances of its recovery that Harihara II assumed imperial titles in “full style”—“the illustrious king of kings and the supreme lord of kings, the lord of the eastern, southern, western and northern oceans; the unopposed; a Vainatēya (*garuda*) to the snakes (of) wicked kings and princes; an adamant cage for refugees: the Dharma (Yudhistira) of the Kali age; the ear ornament to the Goddess of the Karnataka country; the supporter of the four castes and orders;... he whose only delight is the fame of virtue; the destroyer of the pride of the *Tiger*: the master in establishing the *Chera*, *Chōla* and *Pandya* kings; the publisher of the Commentaries on the Vedas; the master in establishing the ordinances prescribed by the Vedas:

The subjugation of the hitherto politically powerful Kurumbar became a matter of necessity to the first Vijayanagara rulers in their attempt to spread their power in the northern portion of the Tamil country. According to tradition embodied in the Mackenzie Mss., we have a curious version of the estrangement between the Kurumbar and the Vijayanagara kings. The Kurumbar had fortified many places and established their rule over several districts. They tried to make the land-owning classes like the Vellālas render them services which the latter resisted and rejected with contempt. Hence the upper classes had to seek the aid of the barbers who promised them relief. When one of the Kurumbar died, the barbers went to shave their heads in accordance with custom and each one managed to cut the throat of the Kurumbar as he was shaving. Thus the community of the Kurumbar was said to have been destroyed by the barbers.

Krishna Deva Raya, as we have already seen, destroyed the Marutham fort built by the Kurumbar with the aid of one Bomma Raja of Chingleput.

he who has provided the *Adhvaryu* with employment..." As Dr. S. K. Aiyangar aptly remarks:—"We may pardon the egoism, and appreciate the praise-worthy effort underlying it"—pp. 187-8—*South India and her Muhammadan Invader*.

According to tradition we also learn that the rulers of Vijayanagara were benevolent towards the agriculturists who were the hereditary foes of the Kurumbars whom they had supplanted as a result of the conquests of Chola Ādondai Chakravarthi. The Vijayanagara rulers are said to have helped the Vellālars and the Vanniars against the Kurumbars. The Vijayanagara dominion gradually expanded over Southern India. It became in course of time so extensive that it had to be divided into provinces for administrative purposes. Each province was under a Nayak who wielded absolute power in his own jurisdiction. There were three such important nayaks under the Vijayanagara Empire besides several minor ones. These were the Nayaks of Madura, Tanjore and Gingee.

CHAPTER III

Gingee under the Vijayanagara Nayaks

Gingee became the seat of a line of Nayak rulers whose jurisdiction extended along the sea coast from the Palar on the north to the Coleroon on the south. Gingee played a prominent role under the Nayaks who greatly enlarged its fortifications.

John Neihoff has referred in his travels to the three Nayaks of Vijayanagara. He has observed: - "There are three great Nayaks in this part of the Indies, i.e., the Nayaks of Madura, Tanjore and Gingee." Another, Jesuit, Father Vico, in his letter of 1611, has also referred to the three great Nayaks who were tributaries to Vijayanagara, paying an annual tribute of six to ten million francs. One can well realise the power of the Nayaks from the considerable amount of tribute they paid to the Vijayanagara monarch.

The Madura Nayaks were the most powerful and the longest-lived of these three lines. The Nayak dynasty of Tanjore was composed of only four rulers and their rule lasted only for a little over a century. Information about the Gingee Nayaks and their rule is very scanty, relatively very much so, in comparison with that available for the other two lines.

Though the Mackenzie Manuscripts give a list of the Gingee Nayaks, we have reliable information only about one, Krishnappa Nayaka. Epigraphical evidence for constructing the history of these Nayaks is very small; and in fact no single inscription has been found in the name of even Krishnappa Nayaka. Two inscriptions (of the year 1918, Nos. 860 and 861) found in Tirupparankunram in the Madura district give lists of the chiefs of Gingee and make a reference to the last of the Nayaks who made a pilgrimage to Rameswaram.

Sources for the period. The sources for the history of Gingee under its Nayaks are the following:—

(1) The Mackenzie Manuscripts which include the *Karnāṭaka Rājākaḷaḥ Saṁstāra-charitam*.

(2) The observations of Jesuit missionaries and other foreign travellers like Father Pimenta, Anquetil du Perron and others.

(3) The indigenous literary sources that have the value of contemporary evidence; e.g., the *Ragunāthābhayudhayam* and the *Sāhitya Ratnākara*.

Criticism of the Sources. The Mackenzie Manuscripts embody more of tradition and

legend than of sober historical facts. Colin Mackenzie collected the above manuscripts by visiting all the notable places between the Krishna and the Cape Comorin, accompanied by his native assistants who were employed to take copies of all inscriptions and obtain, from every possible source, all historical and quasi-historical records and original statements of even existing local traditions and *sthalapurāṇas*.*

* Colonel Colin Mackenzie joined the Madras Engineers in 1782 and acquired a taste for historical and antiquarian studies when he was at Madura in the company of Mr. Johnstone, the son-in-law of Lord Napier and the father of Sir Alexander Johnstone, one of the founders of the Royal Asiatic Society. It was then that Mackenzie formed "the plan of making that collection which afterwards became the favourite object of his pursuit for 38 years of his life and which is now the most extensive and most valuable collection of historical documents relative to India that ever was made by any individual in Europe or in Asia" (Sir A. Johnstone's evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1832). In 1796 Mackenzie secured the assistance of a learned Brahman Pandit, Kavali Venkata Boriah, who served as "the first step of his introduction into the portals of Hindu knowledge", and from whom he came to appreciate the genius of Hindu, and especially of Brahman, scholarship. By 1810, Mackenzie was able to collect over 3,000 inscriptions. He became Surveyor-General of Madras in 1810 and of India in 1816 and carried to Calcutta his literary and antiquarian collections and several of his Indian assistants. After his death in 1821 the whole collection was bought by the Marquis of Hastings. A large portion, including *mss.* in Sanskrit, Persian, Arabic Javanese and Burman, was despatched to England in 2 instalments in 1823 and 1825. Prof. H. H. Wilson, then Secretary to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, catalogued and indexed the material (not the whole) in 2 volumes;

The *History of the Carnataka Governors*, which is embodied in the Mackenzie Manuscripts is very faulty in chronology; it was compiled by one Narayanan who claimed to be a descendant of the Ananda Kon race of Gingee rulers. It was done at the request of Col. Macleod who was the Commissioner of Arcot in the beginning of the 19th century, when Lord William Bentinck was the Governor of Madras. Being compiled two centuries after many of the events described therein, it is but natural that the chronology is faulty, and that it relies largely on local tradition and legends. The chronicle has to be used with much caution. Though this account cannot stand the test of vigorous historical criticism, it is useful as investing the history of Gingee with some degree of life and blood.

and in an appendix gave short notices of the Local Tracts. At his suggestion the books etc. relating to the Dravidian languages were sent over to Madras. In 1835 W. Taylor published the results of his examination of the *mss.* in Tamil; He followed this up with a number of analytical reports (in the issues of the *Madras Journal of Literature and Science*) and finally with his *Catalogue Raisonné of Oriental Manuscripts* (3 vols. 1857) which included a survey of the collections of C. P. Brown and J. Leyden. The rich Mackenzie Collection in Madras was subsequently entrusted to Government and housed in their Oriental Mss. Library. The historical *mss.* are being examined, with a view to publication, of their importance, or summaries by the Indian History Department of the University of Madras.

The Jesuit records and the writings of foreign travellers like Father Pimenta, Anquetil du Perron and others constitute a more reliable source for our period. Though the Jesuit letters were intended merely to report periodically on the activities of the missionaries to their superiors in Europe, they embodied notices of historical events. Their culture and their intimate knowledge of the country and some of the people enabled them to furnish fairly reliable data. Any history of South India in the 17th century cannot be deemed to be full without the material of the Jesuit records being utilised therein for evaluation. They contribute much to a proper perspective of the political events, particularly regarding those which affected their fortunes. The Jesuits had a correct historic sense and had analysed the political situation of the country, though they were partial in their views at times. Their testimony can be tested by other sources of information.

For our period we have the letters from Malabar including those of Father Pimenta who visited Gingee when Krishnappa Nayaka was its ruler, about 1597 A. D. Pierre du Jarric was a French Jesuit whose work, though not original, is a reliable reproduction, on a large scale, of first-hand information.

He faithfully collected all the Jesuit records which would have otherwise been inaccessible and summarised them for our benefit. The materials he collected were in different languages; and hence there have crept in errors of translation here and there.*

* Father Pierre du Jarric, entered the Society of Jesus in 1582 and was professor at Bordeaux. He completed his *Histoire* in 1614 and died three years later. The work consists of three parts, each part containing two books. Books I and II give an account of the life and work of St. Francis Xavier, and of the missions in India (Travancore, Cochin, Calicut, Vijayanagar, Bengal, etc.) Pegu and the Moluccas, down to 1599. Part II gives an account of the missions in Africa, China, Brazil and the Mughal Empire down to the same date; and the third part gives an account of these missions, bringing the history of their activities down to 1610.

The work of Du Jarric is a compilation, largely based on the works of Guzman (down to 1599) and of Guerreiro (down to 1609) as well as on original letters from missionaries. Mr. C. H. Payne who has carefully studied Du Jarric's work, says that he "used his authorities with fidelity, either literally translating or carefully summarising"; and that considering the nature of the materials he used, "our wonder is not that Du Jarric made errors, but that he made so few".

A Latin translation of the entire work by Martinez was published at Cologne in 1615 and entitled *Thesaurus Rerum Indicarum*. The latter is the authority ordinarily quoted and is, on the whole, a faithful translation, though not free from inaccuracies. C. H. Payne has translated portions of Du Jarric into English, under the title of *Akbar and the Jesuits* (1926—Broadway Travelers). See E. Maclagan: *The Jesuits and the Great Mogul* (1932)—ch. I: Sources of Information: and C. H. Payne: Introduction.

Father N. Pimenta, whose letters have been utilised by contemporary and later writers, became a member of the Society of Jesus in 1562, taught for some years at

The transition of Gingee to Vijayanagara rule may now be summarised. After the achievements of Kamparaya and Gōpanār-ya, we come to the famous Ālampūndi grant of Virūpāksha (A. D. 1382). The Brahmans of Ālampūndi in the province of Gingee were given the *sarvamānyam* of the village which had already been given by his father. In the Adivarāha temple at Singavaram, there is a record of Virūpāksha dated Saka 1309, recording a gift (Inscription No. 234 of 1904). Ālampūndi is a village situated six miles to the west of Gingee. The grant was probably by Virūpāksha, son of Harihara II, who is here addressed as Kumāra-Virūppaṇṇa Udaiyār in order to distinguish him from his namesake, the son of Bukka I, who seems to have had nothing to do with the Tamil country. Virū-

Evora and at Coimbra and was sent to India as Visitor in 1596, in charge of the Provinces of Goa and Malabar. He remained in India till his death at Goa in 1614.

Father A. Laerzio was "the true founder of the Southern Province whose greatest achievement was the Madura Mission." (See D. Ferroli's *The Jesuits in Malabar*: Vol. I (1939), p. 276). He had written notes on Guzman's *History* which were useful to Du Jarric in his work.

Anquetil Du Perron was "a weird pioneer of oriental scholarship" and spent some years in India about the middle of the 18th century. He discovered the *Avesta* in 1771, and translated the Persian translation of the Upanishads brought by Bernier, into a queer jargon of Latin, Greek and Persian in 1801; and this caught the attention of the German philosopher, Schopenhauer.

pāksha is said to have conquered the Tundira, Chola and Pandya countries and presented the booty got from his conquests to his father. The inscription ends with Harihara II, whose son, Virūpāksha, was in charge of this portion of the South Arcot district. A Sanskrit drama, entitled *Nārāyaṇa Vilāsa*, written by Virūpāksha, corroborates the information of the Ālampūdi grant. Gingee had thus become unmistakably the headquarters of a province as early as 1383 A. D.*

According to the *Varadāmbika Parināyam* which gives a detailed account of the campaigns of Narasa Nayaka, the founder of the third dynasty of Vijayanagara, we learn that he first marched across the Tondamandalam country and then approached the border of the Chola country whose chief opposed his progress, was defeated in a fierce battle and imprisoned by him. Narasa Nayaka took possession of Tanjore and then proceeded to the conquest of the region lying further south.

In the eighth section of his *Chronicle*, Narayanan narrates that during the reign of Krishnadeva Raya, the Gingee country was divided among several petty chiefs who

* See above pp. 51—56 for an examination of the grant.

did not acknowledge the authority of the emperors of Vijayanagara. In order to reduce them, Krishna Raya sent a considerable army into Carnatic which is said to have consisted of 100,000 men, under the command of four chiefs named Vaiyappa Nayakar, Tubāki Krishnappa Nayakar, Vijayaraghava Nayakar and Venkatappa Nayakar. The army encamped near Vellore. No battle or attack on the fort is there noticed; but the mention of the ready submission of all the chiefs of the surrounding region seems to point to a victory of the imperial army. Narayanan says that the chief of Chittoor and other petty rulers of the Tondamāṇḍalam country had an interview with Vaiyappa Nayakar who seems to have been the *generalissimo* of the army. One of the chiefs mentioned is Bomma Reddi of Kalahasti. At this interview, Vaiyappa fixed the tributes to be paid by all the chiefs who had submitted. From Vellore the imperial army next proceeded to Gingee. Here another conference was held with the chiefs of the Cholaṁḍalam, at which their tributes were also fixed. While in Gingee, the general of Krishnadeva Raya despatched the captains under him towards the south to levy tributes on and exact submission from the chiefs of the Pandya, Chola, and Chera regions. They were respectfully received

by those chiefs who duly agreed to render tribute and submission. Krishnadeva Raya derived, in the shape of these tributes, three crores of rupees from all the rulers of the eastern Karnataka country. For the administration of these newly acquired dominions, he divided the whole land into three divisions under three viceroys. The first extended along the coast from Nellore to the river Coleroon; this was placed under Tubāki Krishnappa Nayakar who fixed his capital at Gingee. The second was the fertile country watered by the Kaveri river, and was governed by Vijaya Raghava, who resided at Tanjore. Finally, the third was the whole country south of the said Kaveri river, and this was assigned to Venkatappa Nayakar, who eventually settled at Madura.” *

* The *Chronicle* further says that “in Tanjore Trichinopoly, Madura and Tiru’ Nagari (South Travancore?) the kings respectfully answered to the demands. Thus the eastern Carnataca (as distinguished from Mysore etc.) became subject to the Rayer. He derived three crores of rupees from this country and in consequence, he divided the whole into three parts under three viceroys.”—Taylor, *Catalogue Raisonné*, III, p. 39.

“The two accounts of these expeditions, that given by Nuniz, the contemporary chronicler of the reign and that of Narayanan, seem to refer to the same events, for the aim of both was the same, *viz.* the subjection of the eastern Karnataka. After the expeditions the country was divided among the generals of Krishna Raya. Moreover, the Catuir of Nuniz about which so much difficulty had been raised, may be a corruption for Chittoor. Finally the first city that fell into the hands of the imperialists

Du Jarric's work was very largely an account of Catholicism and its spread, and a history of the labour of the Jesuit missions in India. Hence it did not contain much political information. Anquetil du Perron, a French traveller and a Jesuit, has also given an account of Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee.

The indigenous literary sources* of our period have also brought to light some phases of the rule of the Gingee Nayaks.

seems to have been, according to Narayanan, Vellore. Now Sewell's note identifies the unnamed city captured by Krishnadeva Raya with this city of Vellore: 'The description of the town answers to Vellore in North Arcot, the fine old fort at which place is surrounded with a deep moat. According to tradition, this place was captured by Krishna Deva Raya from a Reddi chief.' An apparent objection to the identification of these two campaigns may be the fact that the expedition mentioned by Nuniz was led by the same sovereign, who is not mentioned in Narayanan's account. But if we consider that the capture of Vellore seems to have been omitted by the latter, we may also conclude that the fact of Krishna Deva Raya not being mentioned cannot afford a valid argument against our theory."

* Note on the indigenous literary sources:—There are several indigenous chronicles like the work of Narayanan in Tamil, the *Tanjāvūri Āndhra Rājūla Charitamu* and the *Tanjāvūricari Charitam*. They are useful as sources for the 16th century history of Carnataca; and they are supplemented by a volume of literary evidence, the largest portion of which relates to Tanjore. Thus we have the *Sāhityaratnākara* of Yagnanārāyana Dikshita and the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* of Ramabadrām-ba, both of them in Sanskrit; and the *Vijayarāghava Vamsāvali* of Chengaḷuvala Kālakavi in Telugu. The *Sanḡita Śudha* by Raghunātha Nayaka along with illuminating introduction to it by his famous minister,

The two works by the name of *Raghunāthābhyudhayam* and the *Sāhityaratnākaram* which deal with the brilliant exploits of Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore mention incidentally Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee who was a contemporary of his. These sources do not deal with any of the other Nayaks of Gingee except the contemporary of Raghunatha.

The first *Raghunathabyudayam* is a Telugu drama by Vijayaraghava Nayak, the son of Raghunatha. It gives a description of the palace of Tanjore and makes a reference to the pictures depicting Raghunatha's victory over one Śōḷaga of Coleroon, (Dīvukottah!) and the representations of his successes over the Pandya, Chola and Tundira kings, *i.e.* Madura and Gingee Nayaks. The second work of the name is a Sanskrit poem, which was written by the talented poetess, Ramabhadramba, of the court of Raghunatha. It refers to the relationship of Raghunatha and Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee, who was released by the intercession of the former when he was in the prison of Venkata I. The *Sāhityaratnākara*

Govinda Dikshita and the *Raghunathā-bhyudaya Natakam* in Telugu of Vijayaraghava Nayaka contain "what may be regarded as the official version of the history of the Tanjore Nayaks" For an evaluation of these sources see V. Vridhagirisan's *The Nayaks of Tanjore*, Ch. I (Annamalai University Journal Vol. IX No. 2) and also *Sources of Vijayanagara History*.

is a Sanskrit poem dealing with the same Nayak written by Yagna Narayana Dīkshita, son of the famous Govinda Dīkshita, the minister of Achyuta Nayak and of Raghunatha Nayak of Tanjore.

We have also got a few other such similar sources of information that can be regarded as contemporary evidence.

The word, Nayak, is derived from the Sanskrit term Nāyaka, meaning a leader, chief or general. The variations of the word Nayak, Neyk or Nayaka, signify as much as a governor, vassal or viceroy under the jurisdiction of the kingdom of Vijayanagara. Having subsequently revolted against their liege-lord or implicitly renounced his overlordship, each of them assumed semi-royal titles and power. The word, Nayak, is generally used to apply to all army captains. The use of the term as meaning a provincial viceroy is peculiar to the Vijayanagara empire. Hence we find the rulers of Madura, Tanjore and Gingee being generally known and described as Nayaks. But kings like the Pandyas, the Cholas, the Hoysalas and other non-Vijayanagara rulers seem to have applied the word Nayak to their commanders, captains or officials, such as agents, as is evidenced in a large number of their inscriptions.

Two inscriptions found at Tirupparankunram in the Madura district, already noted, give a list of the Gingee Nayak rulers and mention that they emigrated first to Vijayanagara, from Maṇināgapura or (Māṇikhpur near Allahabad) and the immigration is said to have taken place in 1370 A. D. The immigration of the chiefs from Vijayanagara to Gingee in the time of Vaiyappa appears to have taken place five generations before Varadappa Nayaka, about the middle or in the latter part of the 16th century.

We have not been able to ascertain the causes of such emigration from Aryāvarta to Vijayanagara and then to Gingee. We find in the inscription of Sūrappa Nayaka, the Nayak being called the Lord of Maṇināgapura.

Without establishing the connection of Sūrappa Nayaka with the Nayaks of Gingee it is not possible to support the view that the Gingee Nayaks came originally from Maṇināgapura. We have no other evidence to prove that the Gingee chiefs were the original immigrants from Maṇināgapura to Vijayanagara.

We have not got reliable information about the circumstances that led to the foundation of the Nayakship of Gingee.

According to the *Karnātaka Rājakkāl Savistāra Charitam*, an army of the Vijayanagara king defeated the Kurumba chief of Gingee, Kobiligan by name, and took possession of the place. An account of the Kurumbar has been given above. The expedition referred to must have been that of Kumāra Kampana, for during his campaign in the south, we find his Brahman general, Gōpanārya, having his head-quarters at Gingee. Gōpanārya seems to have exercised jurisdiction as far south as Chidambaram, for we find in the *Vaishnava Guruparampara*, a mention of the great Acharya, Sri Vēdānta Dēsika, persuading Gōpanārya of Gingee to restore the image of Govindaraja of Chidambaram which had been thrown out of the shrine. The *Guruparampara*, while tracing the fortunes of the Tillai Govindaraja temple, refers to Sri Vēdānta Dēsika who is said to have requested Gōpanārya to reconsecrate the image in the shrine about 1370.*

* Another Vaishnava work, the *Prapannāmrtam*, attributes the honour to one Māhāchārya of Sholinghur; and it says that the Chola, Krimikanta Kulottunga, had the Govindaraja idol removed from the shrine in the Chidambaram temple. The *Kulōttunga Chōlan Ulā* and the *Rājarāja Chōlan Ulā* both refer to the same king who caused the idol to be thrown into the sea. Sri Ramanuja, the great founder of Sri Vaishnavism, had then established and consecrated the Govindaraja shrine in the temple at Lower Tirupati, in the place of the one at Chidambaram that had been desecrated by the Chola. Later Vaishnava Acharyas had, according to the *Pra-*

The Nayak Rulers of Gingee

A regular viceroyalty seems to have been established only from 1464 A. D. when Venkatapathi Nayak became the ruler of Gingee. The copper plate grant of Vala or Bala Venkatapathi Nayaka (son or a descendant of Vala Krishnappa Nayaka, Raja of Gingee, Saka 1386 (1464 A. D.) Parthiva, Kaliyuga, 1465 cyclic year) refers to the adjudication of a dispute. This Nayak seems to have persecuted the Jainas; and the memory of his persecution is supported by the still surviving Jaina tradition in the neighbourhood and by a mention of it in the Mackenzie Mss. Vol. I. A number of inscriptions found in the South Arcot district indicate Sāluva Narasinga's dominion over Gingee; and probably the Nayaks were the deputies of Narasinga.

According to the *Mackenzie Mss.*, Krishnadeva Raya had to send sardars into the

pannāmrtam, tried to reconsecrate the deity, and translate it on a secure basis to its original shrine, with the help of the Vijayanagara emperors. The reconsecration of Gōpanārya was certainly not the one in which Mahāchārya (or Doddācharya) of Sholinghur took part as it was in Achyuta Raya's consecration in 1539 that he is known to have taken a definite part.

Rao Saheb M. Raghava Iyengar has endeavoured to hold that this Chola who desecrated the Vishnu shrine in Chidambaram, was Kulottunga II (1135-1146) who did the act with a view to widen the shrine of Siva. A note on the vicissitudes of the Vishnu shrine of Chidambaram is given below, later in the book.

Karnataka country to strengthen his authority there. The Raya himself marched into the Carnatic along with his chief Nayaks, Vaiyappa Nayaka, Tubāki Krishnappa Nayaka and others. After strengthening his master's authority in the south, Vaiyappa left the country appointing Tubāki Krishnappa Nayaka his second in command, to rule over the land. We have to take that Tubāki Krishnappa was the founder of the Nayak line of Gingee kings. He seems to have ruled gloriously all over the coast from Nellore down to the Coleroon up to 1521 A. D., (Saka 1443). We are not able to ascertain the exact extent of his power for want of reliable inscriptional evidence. The date of the accepted irruption of Krishnadeva Raya into the Carnatic could have been only some years after 1509; and if we take it that Vaiyappa had appointed Tubāki Krishnappa as the Nayak of Gingee, the latter could have been the ruler of the place only from after the epoch of the Raya's conquests, *i.e.* after about 1520—21.

Venkatapathi Nayak who acquired notoriety as the persecutor of the Jainas in 1478 A. D., was also known in local tradition as Dupala Krishnappa Nayaka; and the problem arises of his possible identity with Tubāki

Krishnappa Nayak.* If we identify Tubāki Krishnappa with the Nayak of the persecution fame, we must credit him with a very long rule of at least 57 years from 1464 to 1521 A. D. The copper plate grant of Venkatapathi is dated Saka 1386 (1464 A. D.). Tubāki Krishnappa should thus have been very old at the time of his death. Moreover, the regular Nayak line of rulers seems to have begun only from the irruption of Krishnadeva Raya, though Gingee is said to have been for long a Vijayanagara viceroyalty, and, according to the Ālampūdi grant, even from 1383 A. D. It has been said that a duly constituted governorship began only from 1464 A. D., when Venkatapathi Nayak had become the ruler of Gingee. We have to take 1464 A. D. as the probable date of the beginning of the regular succession of the Gingee governors, if we identify Tubāki Krishnappa Nayaka with the Nayaka of 1464 A. D. But it discards the view that the Nayak line was founded after Krishnappa Nayak's entry into the Carnatic which took place only after 1509 A. D.

Moreover, the line of Nayak rulers mentioned in the Mackenzie Mss. runs as follows:—

1. Vaiyappa Nayaka, 1490 A. D.

* There was another Tubāki or Tupāki Krishnappa Nayak ruling in Gingee in the 17th century who was associated with the Bijapur and Golconda rule over the place.

2. Tubāki Krishnappa Nayaka, 1490 to 1520 A. D.

3. Achyuta Vijaya Ramachandra Nayaka, 1520—1540 A. D.

4. Muthiālu Nayaka, 1540—1550 A. D.

5. Venkatappa Nayaka, 1570—1600 A. D.

6. Varadappa Nayaka, 1600—1620 A. D.

7. Appa Nayak (up to the Muslim conquest).

The chronology given by S. M. Edwardes in his paper 'A Manuscript History of the Rulers of Gingee' (*The Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 55,) is as follows:—*

Muthial Naik, 1476 A. D.

Krishnappa Naik, 1516 A. D.

Chenam Naik, 1536 A. D.

Vijayappa Naik, 1555 A. D.

Gangama Naik, 1580 A. D.

Venkatakrishna Naik, 1605 A. D.

Venkataram Naik, 1625 A.D.

Trimbakmal Krishnappa Naik, 1645 A. D.

Varadappa Naik, 1655 A. D.

* "The manuscript, which is written on country-made paper in the Modi character and is in several

places difficult to decipher, owing to the bad writing of the scribe and the attacks of white ants, bears on its title-page the English words 'Account of the Chengy Rajahs'. The identity of the scribe or author is unknown, and there is no clue thereto in the manuscript, which purports to be a *kaifiyat* or record of the rulers of Chandi (Chengy) or in modern spelling, of Gingee or Jinji in the Arcot district of the Madras Presidency. Readers of this *Journal* may be interested in learning the main facts set forth in the Mss., so far as I was able to elucidate them.

"The narrative commences with the statement that during the reign of Krishna Rayel of Anegondi, a certain Vijayaranga Naik (according to one account, Gingee was built on an old foundation of the Chola kings in 1442 by Vijayaranga Naik, governor of Tanjore) came with a permit to Chandi (Gingee) and there secured a *jagir*. He cleared the forest, amassed riches, and effected the settlement of Chandi. In Fasli 852 (A. D. 1445) a Dhangar named Anandakona, who was searching for some stray flocks belonging to his tribe, met a *Mahāpurusha*, who informed him that by his exertions Chandi was destined to become a great place, and that he should straightway go to Vijayaranga Naik. In accordance with this prophecy, the kingdom of Chandi was established with the help of Anandakona, whose son, Tristapitla, became prime minister of the Chandi kingdom."

.....
 "To revert to the Mss., we are next informed that the families of Vijayaranga Naik and Anandakona enjoyed undisputed possession of Chandi (Gingee) for 224 years, i.e. to Fasli 1077, and that the names of Vijayaranga's successors were as follows:—

Fasli	883	(A. D. 1476)	Mutiyal Naik.
„	918	(„ 1511)	Krishnappa Naik.
„	943	(„ 1536)	Chenam Naik.
„	962	(„ 1555)	Vijayapa Naik.
„	987	(„ 1580)	Gangama Naik.
„	1012	(„ 1605)	Venkat Krishna Naik.
„	1032	(„ 1625)	Venkat Ram Naik.

* Tubāki Krishnappa and Vaiyappa are credited with having built temples at Srī-mushṇam, Tirukkōyilūr and other places wherein their sculptures could now be seen. The big granaries in the Gingee fort, the Kal-yāṇa Mahāl and the thick walls enclosing the

Fasli 1052 (A. D. 1645) Trimbakmal Krishnappa Naik.

„ 1062 („ 1655) Varadappa Naik.

Pp. 1—2 of the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. LV (1926).

This account is supposed to be from a *ms.*, bearing the words, "Mackenzie Collection, Dec. 3, 1833 : No. 38". The existing catalogue does not include "this particular *ms.* which has hitherto escaped scrutiny and elucidation". It associates the Kon dynasty of Gingee with the Nayak governors of Vijayanagara and makes the two lines contemporary ; whereas it is fairly well established that the Kon rulers preceded the period of the Nayak rulers.

According to the account which goes down to the closing years of the 18th century, ending abruptly with the capture of Gingee by Tipu Sultan (held to have taken place in Fasli 1199 = A. D. 1792), the place was burnt by the Mysore Sultan who also destroyed the artillery-parks in the three forts. Mr. Edwardes says that "the story of the foundation of Jinji and of the Naik dynasty and the Dhangar ministers seems to me to deserve a closer and more detailed inquiry". All that we learn from the *Carnātaka Rājākkal Savistāra Charitam* is that Gopalakrishna Pillai, and his son, Nandagopala Pillai, who were probably of the Yadava (shepherd) caste, were ministers to the Nayaks from the time of Tubāki Krishnappa to Varadappa.

* Tubāki Krishnappa Nayaka gave, according to Narāyana Kon, the name of Rajagiri to the great hill Anandagiri ; he built on its summit a large surrounding rampart and constructed a tunnel giving access to a grotto, in which were built the royal palace, granaries for storing paddy and other foodstuffs, a well, the temple of

three hills of Gingee are also credited to Krishnappa Nayaka. The images of Krishnappa and his companions are sculptured in the pillars in the shrine of Srīmushṇam, Tirukoyilur and other places in the neighbourhood. His long and peaceful administration resulted in the expansion of the town and the creation of pettahs and suburbs. The building activity of this earlier Krishnappa is to some extent confused with that of a later Krishnappa who ruled in the latter part of the 16th century.

Ramaswami and a powder magazine. On the extreme top of the hill he built a peristyle going round a court and furnished it with windows and a grand gateway. He also constructed a large reservoir at three-quarter height of the hill, and furnished it with two sluices, one above and the other below. The brick-built reservoir previously done by the Kon rulers, was included in the new. At the middle height of the hill was constructed the temple of Kōdanda Ramaswami, along with its tank and mantapams. There were also there the shrine of Kamalakanni and three springs flowing forth from great depths and ever lighted by the sun; and they were now provided with masonry parapets and skirting foot paths. All these were surrounded by a wall pierced by two gates.

The foot of Rajagiri was also encircled by a thick wall, furnished with 2 gates. There were also built a granary with a capacity of 150,000 *kalam*s, a temple, a granary for rice and another for other grains.

In the interior of the palace, a tank was built for bathing surrounded with mantapams. "The Raya Mahal thus rose splendidly with eleven floors"; and level with the ground was the great throne-room. The queen's residence was called the Kalyāṇa Mahal; it was of seven floors surrounded by houses tenanted solely by women. To the south of the paddy granary were built

According to the Mackenzie Mss., Krishnappa's successor was one Achyuta Ramachandra Nayak. An inscription in the Venkataramaṇaswāmi temple of Gingee (No. 244 of 1904) refers to a gift made by Achyuta Vijayaramachandra Nayaka, the governor of Gingee. We find (in page 192 of the *Archæological Survey of India, Annual Report, 1908—9*) a reference to the mahāmandalēswaras and generals of Achyuta Raya, the successor of Krishnadeva Raya. One of such mandalēswaras seems to have been Achyuta Ramachandra Nayaka* who was ruling Gingee in Saka 1464, i.e., A. D. 1540—41. According to the Mackenzie Mss., the next ruler after Achyuta was one Muthialu Nayak who is held to have been the builder of the Venkataramaṇaswami temple at Gingee. The next ruler of Gingee

the temple of Rajagopalaswami (Venkataramanaswami?) and the Senda-Rayan Fort. All round the Krishnagiri hill a double brick-wall was built; and on it rose some paddy granaries, bungalows and 2 temples in honour of Krishnaswami and Ramagopalaswami. Forts called Kuttarisi Durgam and Kurangu Durgam were also built.

A great surrounding wall encircling the fortress of the plain was built from the foot of Chandrayan Durg advancing from the s.e., turning first e, and then n. and going by the temple of Gopala Pillai traversing the bank of the Agaram tank, encircling Krishnagiri and coming back to Rajagiri.

* There is an inscription (244 of 1904) in a ruined temple at Chandragiri, near the palace, recording a gift by Achutharaya Nayaka, governor of Gingee.

was according to the Mackenzie tradition Venkatappa Nayaka.

Under these Nayaks the forts were strengthened and the town was greatly enlarged.*

* Tubaki Krishnappa and his descendants are said to have ruled for 150 years. It was under Krishnappa and his immediate successors that a dam was constructed over the Varāhanadi, a few miles distant from the fortress, at Kūtampet; and after filling the tank of Sirukadambur the water of the river was conveyed by a canal which ran at the foot of the Krishnagiri Hill. A sardar of the shoe-maker caste fortified at his own expense the Chakkili Durgam Hill and dug out a small tank fitted with sluices at its summit. The Pattabhi Rama temple was built at the foot of this hill. More to the east was founded the village of Jayangondan, while a large market town of square shape was also built in closer vicinity to the hills. All the castes of the Left Hand were quartered in these two places.

Other suburban villages like Rajākaranampēttai, Stalakaranampēttai, Kollapālayam were founded at a distance of two *nāḷigai* to the north of Rajagiri and of Madana (Krishna) giri, besides two other villages, Periapēttai and Singārampettai, still further north of Rajagiri. The Right Hand castes were settled in these villages. Nallān Chakravarti Satrayāgam Sēshādri Aiyangar was the Rajaguru of Tubāki Krishnappa who gifted an agraharam to his master after the latter celebrated a yāgam in the cleared Elangādu forest. The Nayak also gave the guru the village of Māmbattu and the *srōtriem* of Singavaram. He also built the Vishnu temple of Sirukadambur and the temple dedicated to Dharmaraja and Draupadi Amman at the north end of Gingee town and entrusted its administration to a member of the old clan of the Kons, declaring that all honours should be first rendered to this Goddess (Draupadi Amman).

Under Achyuta Ramachandra Nayak (*acc.* Fasli 930) the four enclosing walls and the majestic gopuram of the Tiruvannāmalai temple were begun in Saka 1443.

An inscription (No. 240 of 1904) found on the south wall of the central shrine of the Venkataramaṇaswāmi Temple at Gingee dated Saka 1472, Sādhāraṇa, in Tamil, describes a gift by Sūrappa Nayakar for the merit of Sadasivadeva and another gift by Adappattu Mallappa Nayakar for a festival. Another record engraved on the north wall of the Akhilāndēsvari shrine in the temple of Jambai in the Tirukkōyilur taluk, dated Saka 1471, expired, Saumya, of Sadasiva Raya describes the gift of a village for the merit of the king by Adappam Sūrappa Nāyakkaraiyan

Twenty years later he built the Vishnu temple at Tindivanam, a temple and gopuram at Nedungunram and similar edifices at Sēttupattu (Chetpat). He is also credited with the construction of several other temples and *agrahārams*.

Muthialu Nayaka built a small fort on the hillock situated to the west of Chandrāyan Durg and called it after his own name. He also constructed, besides the temple of Venkataramaṇaswāmi a mantapam on the road leading to Varāhanādi, a *teppakuḷam* for the god's festival and a temple to Chakraperumal on its bank. The great gopuram of Tiruvaṇṇāmalai was completed only in *Saka* 1494.

Venkatappa Nayaka, the successor of Muthialu Nayaka, allowed a Jain merchant to build a Jaina shrine at Sittāmūr; and in Tindivanam a Siva shrine and a fort were built. The Nayaka's wife, Mangammal, dug the Ammākūḷam tank on the great Gingee road and another tank of the same name at Vriddhāchalam, on the other side of its river. It was also about this time that the great wall and the gopuram of Vriddhachalam were finished, as well as the *mantapam* before the shrine of the goddess.

Krishnama Nāyakkaraiyan. A poet, Ratna-khita Srinivasa Dīkshitar, lived at the court of Sūrappa Nayaka and dedicated to him the drama of *Bhavanapurushōttama*. According to this work, Sūrappa was the son of Pota Bhūpāla by Vengalāmba and had two brothers, by name Divākara Nayaka and Bhairava Nayaka. Sūrappa founded three villages named respectively after himself and his parents; and he is called by the author as the “firm establisher of the throne of Karnataka” (*Karnātasimhāsanapratisthāpanāchārya*), possibly referring to the help which he rendered to the Raya of Vijayanagar, against one of the Muslim incursions into the south after Talikota. The Raja whom he helped was possibly either Tirumala or Ranga I. The difficulty comes up when the question of fixing Sūrappa among the rulers of Gingee in that period and particularly of defining his relation to Krishnappa who was its ruler in the time of Venkatapathi.

At the battle of Talikota (1565) the Vijayanagara Empire was rudely shaken. The Empire survived indeed as a living political entity for nearly a century more; and some of its rulers of this period were really able men like Tirumala, Srīranga and Venkata I; the last of these was the most illustrious of the fourth dynasty of the kings of

Vijayanagara and did much to maintain the solidarity and the prestige of the empire, against heavy odds. His accession to the throne, superseding his nephews, prompted the nobles and feudatories of the Empire to rebel against his authority. One of such feudatories of the Empire was Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee.

According to the Mackenzie Mss., Venkatappa Nayaka was a contemporary of Venkata I. The date given in Mackenzie Mss. for Venkatappa Nayaka (1570—1600) coincides with the period of rule of Krishnappa Nayaka of the Jesuit records who is regarded as the contemporary of Venkata I and of Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore. Prof. V. Rangacharya has followed the Mackenzie Mss. and has identified Krishnappa Nayaka with Varadappa Nayaka, the son of Venkatappa Nayaka. He has based his conclusions by following mainly the Mackenzie Mss. Moreover, according to inscriptions (Nos. 860—861 of 1918) Varadappa Nayaka seems to have ruled in 1620 A. D. during the last days of the Nayak rule at Gingee. Varadappa Nayaka and Appa Nayaka have been regarded as imbecile rulers who gave way before the Muslim invasion. The view that Krishnappa Nayaka was mistakenly written for Varadappa Nayaka, the son of Venkatappa Nayaka, cannot be easily maintained.

We have to take that Venkatappa Nayak (1570—1600) of Mackenzie Mss. is identical with Krishnappa Nayaka whose dates given in the more reliable and contemporary Jesuit records agree with the dates given in the Mackenzie Mss. Jesuit and other contemporary records do not mention any Varadappa Nayaka as a contemporary of the Emperor Venkata I and of Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore. Nor do the available indigenous literary sources refer to Varadappa Nayaka. Hence the indentification of Mr. Rangacharya has to be discarded.

When Venkata I was on the throne of Vijayanagar, Krishnappa Nayaka was the ruler of Gingee. Anquetil du Perron* calls him the contemporary of Vencapatir. Perron has stated that Krishnappa succeeded his father whose name, however, he does not mention. After the death of his father, Krishnappa must have been imprisoned by his uncle for a time in the fortress of Gingee. According to Father Pimenta, Krishnappa managed to escape from his prison with the

* *Anquetil du Perron* :—Abraham Hyacinthe (1732—1805) went to India as a private soldier in 1754, acquired a considerable knowledge of Sanskrit and translated a dictionary in that language. On the fall of Pondicherry in 1761, he conveyed his manuscripts and writings to Paris and became Oriental Interpreter to the King's Library and a member of the Academy of Inscriptions and *Belles Lettres*.

help of some friends and imprisoned in turn his usurping uncle and also put out his eyes. Anquetil du Perron says that Krishnappa was freed by his own subjects.

In 1586 Krishnappa Nayaka seems to have rebelled against Venkata I who captured him and imprisoned him. Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore rendered help to Krishnappa by requesting from the Emperor an order for his release in return for services rendered to him in repelling the Muhammadans who were then besieging him at Penukonda. Venkata, in gratitude for the help rendered by Raghunatha Nayaka, had to order the immediate release of Krishnappa Nayaka. The Nayak of Gingee then paid his respects to Raghunatha and prostrated himself before him and showed a due sense of his gratitude by giving away his daughter in marriage to him. The *Raghunāthabyudhayam* and the *Sāhitya Ratnākara* both definitely refer to the release of Krishnappa from captivity effected through the help of Raghunatha.

On the occasion of Krishnappa's rebellion the Emperor had sent against him an army under the command of one Venkata, who was an elder brother of the Kalahasti chief, Ankabhupala. This Venkata seems to have marched against him and defeated him.

During the time of Krishnappa's confinement in prison, the Gingee country seems to have been ruled by this Venkata, who, according to the Telugu work, *Ushāpariṇayam*, is said to have constructed a large tank and named it Chennasagaram, after his father. This implies a fairly long rule of Venkata at Gingee and an equally long term of imprisonment for Krishnappa Nayaka. Venkata, the victorious general of the Raya and ruler of Gingee during the interregnum caused by the imprisonment of Krishnappa, was the eldest of the Velugoti chiefs of Kalahasti, of whom we have knowledge of three, namely, Damarla Venkatappa, Damarla Ayyappa and another Anka who was less known, but was a literary figure and the author of the Telugu work—*Ushāpariṇayam*. Venkatappa lived to a good age, because he survived in power the great civil war of 1614—16 which followed the death of Venkatapati Maharaya in 1614 and the reign of Ramadeva (1616—30) and was very powerful in court in the reign of his successor, Venkatapathi (1630—42), being in fact his brother-in-law. Venkatappa was the actual administrator of the Raya's kingdom, remaining at the capital and having his province of Wandiwash managed for him by his brother, Ayyappa who held the government of the Poonamallee country to the west of Madras.

It was from these two brothers that the English obtained the grant of Madraspatnam. (or site of Fort St. George) which, in the Company's records, is ascribed to 'Damarla' Moodu Venkatappa Naick, son of Damarla Chenama Nayak, Grand Vizier of the afore-said sovereign, (i e. the Raya) and Lord General of Carnatica."

Krishnappa Nayaka should have been a wise and able ruler, as Jesuit records bear ample testimony to the prosperity of the city of Gingee, which was then known as the "Troy of the East". Soon after Krishnappa's release from prison, through the efforts of Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore, Father Pimenta made his acquaintance with the Nayaka during his stay at Gingee. We possess a valuable account of Pimenta's dealings with the Nayak and of the city and fortress of Gingee.

Father Pimenta was a Portuguese Jesuit* and spent a few days at Gingee in 1597 A. D.

* "This Portuguese Jesuit was appointed visitor of the Missions of the Society of Jesus in India by the Most Rev. Fr. Claudius Aquaviva, Superior-General of the Society. In the course of his travels he spent a few days at Gingee, in the year 1597. There were no Jesuits then at the court of the Gingee Nayak; but he wanted to pay his respects to Krishnappa Nayaka (1580—1620) the then ruling chief, and to thank him for his hospitality to several of the Jesuit missionaries who had visited his court on business."

Probably when he visited it, Gingee was in the heyday of its glory and was one of the most impregnable and strongest forts in the whole of India and extended as far as and included the present village of Melacheri three miles to the west of the present fort.

There were no Jesuits at that time in the court of Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee; and Pimenta wished to pay his homage to him and thank him for his hospitality to the Jesuit missionaries working in his dominions. Father Pimenta is reported to have first met Krishnappa Nayak at Chidambaram where the latter was superintending the repairs of the Govindaraja temple. He thus says of the city of Gingee:—"We went to Gingee—the greatest city we have seen in India and bigger than any in Portugal except Lisbon. In the midst thereof is a castle like a city high walled with great hewn stones and encompassed with a ditch full of water. In the middle of it is a rock framed into bulwarks and turrets and made impregnable. Father Pimenta seems to have proceeded through the Arcot or Vellore gate. He says that the Nayak appointed their lodging in the square tower, estimated 80 feet high, which has been regarded as the most conspicuous building in the fort. The private dwellings are not elaborate except some belonging to the rich and the

influential people. Among these the palaces of the king are the most prominent built in a peculiar style with towers and verandahs."

"The Naicus appointed our lodging in the Tower, but the heat forced us to the Grove (though consecrated to an Idoll)".

"The next day, the inner part of the Castle was shewed us, having no entrance but by the Gates which are perpetually guarded. In the Court the younger sort were exercised in Tilts. We saw much Ordnance, Powder, and Shot; a Spring also of Cleare water. The Naicus had been here kept by his Uncle, whom yet by help of his friends he forced to become in the same place his unwilling successor, having put out his eyes.".....

Father Pimenta describes Gingee thus:—"The following day the Naicus brought the Fathers into the fort (*viz.* to the fortress which was already called by the author *arx*); as they entered, the reports of the guns and the songs of the buglers expected them, being the soldiers in parade. Whatever rare and precious the fort contained was shown that day to the Fathers. Everything belonging to an impregnable fort seemed to have been adopted in this one. Here the Naicus had been ordered by his uncle to be

kept after the death of his father, but freed by his subjects he confined his uncle in the same fort, whom he preferred to deprive of his eyes and his liberty rather than of his life. Then the king riding on horse back and accompanied by a thousand armed soldiers took over Father Pimenta to the palace." *

* (pp. 42 and 43 of *The Indian Antiquary*, Vol. LIV 1925).

The Jesuit Letters. Their letters throw a flood of light on Venkata I (1578—1614) both as a ruler and as a man. They have been fully utilised by the Rev. H. Heras S.J., in writing his account of the reign of Venkata, which occupies more than a third of his book (*The Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagara*, Vol. I, 1927). The most eminent of these was Father Nicholas Pimenta who, as Visitor on behalf of the General Society of Jesus, directed the establishment in 1597 A. D. of a mission house at Chandragiri, the royal residence. To the Rev. Father Simon de Sa, Rector of the College of San Thomē, was assigned the duty of opening the Mission. He left San Thomē in October 1598 and was duly received by Oba Raya, father-in-law of Venkata, and introduced to the King who received him in audience. He gave them permission to build a church at Chandragiri and elsewhere also if they pleased and promised the grant of a couple of villages for their expenses and for meeting the cost of erecting their Churches. He also gave them a golden palanquin for use, a distinction reserved only to nobles and to religious heads.

Chandragiri had become the capital of the Hindu empire by 1592; and by 1600, the Jesuits had a house and a church at that place and secured from the Raya a yearly grant of 1,000 pagodas, besides certain unsecured income from some villages and lands, "as a sign of his love for the fathers." Venkata I lived generally at Vellore, though the capital continued to be Chandragiri; and by 1606—7, two Jesuit Fathers and Lay Brothers had come to live at the latter place. Venkatapathi Raya had a great admiration for the Jesuits. Father

The Nayak brought the Fathers into the fort with a salute from the fort guns, a welcome from the buglers and a parade of troops.

Whatever was rare and precious in the fort, were shown to the fathers. "Before us 200 Brahmans went in rank to sprinkle the house with holy water and to prevent sorcery against the king which they used every day, when the king first entered the house..... We found him lying on a silken carpet leaning on two cushions in a long silken garment, a great chain hanging from his neck, distinguished with many pearls and gems all over his body and his long hair tied with a knot on the crown adorned with pearls. Some Brahmans and princes attended upon him. This shows the grandeur of the Nayak. He entertained us kindly and marvelled much that we chewed not the betel leaves which were offered to us." He dismissed them with gifts and precious clothes wrought with gold and desired one of their priests for his new city which he was building.

In the fort Pimenta found a great quantity of ordnance, powder and shot. The Nayak

Melchior Coutinho resided in the fortress of Vellore and enjoyed the friendship of the Raja; and Father Antony Dubino resided at Chandragiri. They had influence with the Chikkaraya (Crown Prince), probably the putative son of Venkata, who was suspected to be of spurious origin and was always kept apart from the Raya.

was guarded with a thousand armed men. 300 elephants were paraded before the Nayak, as if they were fitted for a war. At the porch of the palace, the Nayak was greeted with an oration in his praise, a thing usual in their solemn pomp. The Nayak then showed his store of jewels to the Fathers and gave them leave to go to his new city.

This new city referred to by Pimenta was Krishnapatnam which the Nayak had built near Porto Novo on the banks of the Vellar river, in the Chidambaram taluk. The village of Agaram just to the west of Porto Novo, was probably the Krishnapatnam of the Nayak. The building of this town shows the greatness and the power of the Nayak and also the extent of his kingdom. Du Jarric says that "it is located in the country called "Arungor" near the mouth of the river Valarius (Vellar); and it forms the present Hindu quarter of Porto Novo. In order to foster the new foundation, Krishnappa allowed everybody to select his own building site and a piece of land was assigned to each in the outskirts of the city for agricultural purposes. Consequently many buildings were under construction when Pimenta visited the place in 1597—1598 A. D. To superintend the buildings of this town, the Nayak had appointed one Śōlaga of Coleroon, his feudatory and ally who was an

important chief of the Gingee country and played a considerable part in the local history of the period.

Krishnappa asked Pimenta to build a church in this new city and to erect a residence for a priest. The Nayak himself gave a gift of 200 pieces of gold for that purpose. The present was made in the presence of all the grandees and nobles of the court. Accordingly Father Pimenta called Father Alexander Levi, "a man of renowned holiness and of great knowledge of the vernaculars from Travancore and left him at Krishnapatam, the city built by the Nayak to superintend the construction of the church."

Father Pimenta also observed that "in the court of Gingee the younger folk were exercised in tilts which are a kind of military exercise."

The picture here given from the narrative of Pimenta affords us an insight into the splendour of the court of the Nayak of Gingee, his power and influence, and also throws some light on some of the customs of the land.

Krishnappa Nayaka and His Feudatories

One of the Jesuit letters of 1606 states that among the Nayaks of Madura, Tanjore and Gingee, the Nayak of Gingee was the

most powerful, as is evident from the description of Pimenta who visited his court in 1597—1598 A. D.

Father Pimenta mentions the following three feudatories of Krishnappa Nayaka. They were, the Princes of Tiruvati (on the Pennar), and Salavacha (Śōlaga of Coleroon) and Lingama Nayaka of Vellore.

The Śōlaga of the *Raghunāthabhyudhayam* and the *Sāhitya Ratnākara* is called by Pimenta, Salavacha, who occupied Devikota at the mouth of the Coleroon and who was regarded as one of the chiefs of the highest rank. During Father Pimenta's stay at Gingee Śōlaga's son, a boy of 14, accompanied by many men and nobles reached the capital, and asked Krishnappa to name him after himself, with a further request for the grant of a golden chair and several pieces of land. This shows that Śōlaga, his father, was a subordinate of Krishnappa. This young Śōlaga became a friend of the Jesuits; and when the Nayak took leave of his father, he commended them to the care of the young Solaga who escorted them safely to the castle of his father.

The Śōlaga was living in a small fort at the mouth of the Coleroon. He was then said to be 80 years old and exercised absolute

authority among his subjects, being feared by everybody. Pimenta says that he received the Jesuits with great kindness. "He is old and severe and caused crocodiles to be put in his river for his security, charging them not to hurt his own people." The description of Sōlaga given by Pimenta agrees with that given in the *Raghunathabhyudhayam* and the *Sāhitya Ratnakara*. He had occupied an islet near the sea and was giving great trouble to the inhabitants of the surrounding country and used to carry away by force women from the neighbouring region. The *Sāhitya Ratnākara* describes him also as a very cruel man of inhuman tastes. The *Raghunāthabhyudhayam* states that the chief* was so powerful that he defied even strong governors like Vittala Raja.

Another feudatory of Krishnappa was Lingama Nayaka of Vellore whose kingdom was subordinate to the Nayak of Gingee. Lingama was the son of Chinna Bomma, the *protège* of Appayya Dikshita. He was one of the feudatories who rebelled against Venkata

* The descendants of the Sōlaga have now sunk into insignificance. They are petty land-owners and the Sōlaga chief is now the poligar of Pichavaram, a jungly village near the coast between Chidambaram and the mouth of the Coleroon. Sōlaganār is the family title; and the poligar has been enjoying the right of being anointed as chief in the great temple-hall of Chidambaram.

and refused to acknowledge his authority. It is clear from the Jesuit records that he wished to form an independent principality free from his immediate overlord, the Nayak of Gingee and the Emperor. Thus we find Lingama as a feudatory of Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee, though we are unable to know more details about their relationship.

The region of Trivati on the Gadilam river was under the rule of another feudatory of Krishnappa. No information is available as to this ruler.

Wielding such a power as he did, it is likely that he should have cherished ideas of independence of his royal master.

In his first rebellion against Venkata, as we have already seen, Krishnappa was imprisoned and later on released through the efforts of Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore. This humiliation did not damp the spirit or diminish the ambition of Krishnappa, who continued to cherish ideas of independence. The nobles and courtiers of the Raya urged him (about 1600) to capture Gingee and humble the overgrown chief.

Anquetil du Perron states "that Venkata had many reasons to wage war against Krishnappa" without giving any one of them.

He believes that "the refusal of the payment of tribute annually was the main reason for the war."

News about the insanity of Krishnappa reached the ears of the Emperor when he was about to march against him. This madness seems to have been only a pretence as Fr. Coutinho says and "that the fraud is now patent that the king feigned to be out of his senses in order to please four of the grandees of the kingdom, who were afterwards killed by his order." * Venkata seems to have abandoned his march to Gingee despite the advice of the nobles, as the Gingee Nayak was reported to have become insane.

A few years later, in 1604, Krishnappa Nayaka sent an embassy to Venkata, according to a Jesuit letter. But in the war that was waged towards the end of 1607, the Nayak was defeated with ignominy.

According to the letter of Coutinho, the tardiness of the Nayak in paying the tribute resulted in the despatch of captains to conquer the lands of the kingdom of Gingee. One of these captains was Vēlugōti Yachama Naidu who, according to the *Vēlugōtivāri Vamsā-*

* Heras' 'The Aravidu Dynasty', Vol. I: page 408.

vali (Wilson's *Collections*, p. 274) captured Gingee.*

“While the imperial army was approaching the fortress, God wanted to punish the Nayak who was within”, says Coutinho. “Had he remained in the fortress nobody would have defeated him, for it is impregnable; but he the Nayak, being too arrogant, went out to meet the army of Venkata. Then his own captains deserted him and the Nayak fell a prisoner into the enemy's hands. The Jesuit adds, that “he distributed his earrings and other jewels he bore on his chest

* Vēlugōti Yāchama Nayaka, of the 20th generation of the Vēlugōti family, was, ‘perhaps the most distinguished warrior of the line, He first distinguished himself under his cousin, Chenna, in the Muhammadan wars during the early years of the reign of Venkatapati, in the siege of Gandikotta and in the capture of the forts of Gutti and Kurnool. He further distinguished himself by defeating Dāvula Pāpa who came down upon him at Uttaramallur and played a most heroic part in the great civil war of 1614-16. The victory at Uttaramallur was over Dāvula Pāpa who was sent by Lingama Nayaka of Vellore with the help of troops furnished by the rulers of Gingee and Madura (1601 A. D.) He saved the town from the attack of the enemy, routed the besiegers and killed Pāpa in the fight. After the great civil war, Yāchama had to continue the struggle against Yatiraja a younger brother of Jaggaraya, still supported by the Nayaks of Gingee and Madura and defeated him in a battle near Pālayamkōttai (South Arcot District). He then celebrated at Vellore the coronation of Rama as the emperor of Karnataka, with considerable pomp and dignity (1616).—(*Velugōlivārivamsāvali*, edited with introduction by Dr. N. V. Ramanayya, (1939)—p.p. 56-59 of Introduction.)

among his opponents in order to induce them not to kill him. Such was the great victory won on the New Year's Day 1608". (Anquetil du Perron, quoted by H. Heras : Vol. I, page 166).

The Raya set out for Gingee when the news was received at his court at Vellore (where he had established himself after the defeat of Lingama Nayak at Minnal by Venkata, the founder of Chennasagaram,) when Lingama rebelled against him. Father Coutinho says that the imprisoned Nayak prostrated before the Emperor's feet with his family and agreed to pay him 600,000 cruzados. The King retired to Vellore and the Nayak of Gingee moved by the loss of his treasure and elephants, retired to Singavaram near his capital, saying that he did not want to govern any more and so on. The Nayaks of Madura, and Tanjore who were his kinsmen placated him with many gifts and caused him to return to the capital and rule the land.

Krishnappa's Relations with the Portuguese and the Dutch.

The glorious picture of India given by Huyghen van Linschoten kindled the enthusiasm of the Dutch for eastern enterprise. In 1595 they set out with a fleet of four ves-

sels commanded by Cornelius Houtman and voyaged to the east. When they reached the west coast of India they found the political condition of Malabar quite favourable and entered into an alliance with the Zamorin of Calicut, with a view to secure the expulsion of the Portuguese and the building of a fort at that place.

The Dutch then tried to penetrate into the Bay of Bengal and sought the permission of Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee to build a fort at Dēvanāmpatnam (modern Fort St. David, Cuddalore N. T.) which was, subsequently, granted in 1608. The Jesuit letter informs us that the Dutch were treated hospitably and were allowed to build a citadel at the place of their landing.

The Nayak's *olla* (or farman) in which the first concession to the Dutch was made is dated 30th November 1608. The Jesuit letter states that after obtaining the *olla* the Dutch diligently began to build the citadel.

The Nayak's Olla :—“ We promise to protect the Dutchmen who will settle in Tegnapatam to allow them to build a town, to refuse entrance to the Portuguese to whom we shall remain hostile. On the other hand we, the Dutchmen, promise to bring all kinds

of goods, to traffic with all traders on the condition that they will pay us four for every 100 of our merchandise excepting rice. We shall also pay 4 for every 100 of our merchandise we carry away from there. Those who have paid once will not pay again. We promise to take the oath and to keep all the conditions faithfully."

It seems that at Tegnapatam there was an old fort (*Rea-Monumental Remains of South India*, p. 13). The Dutch began to construct the fort on receipt of the *olla*.*

* The following account taken by Father H. Heras from a book by Suarez De Figueroa (1) Madrid, MDCXIII datable 1607 or 1608 runs thus:—

"In the year Iauxara, in the March moon :

Letter of the King of Kings, Great Lord, Great
Knight,

King Vencatapati, very great king, to the most
powerful,

Lord of the Sea and of the Land, Don Filipe,

(Philip III), King of Portugal etc.....

I learn how the Dutch, rebel subjects of Your Majesty came to Girola (Gingee) to talk with the Naique and they requested from him the harbour of Taunapatam (Tevanampatnam, Fort St. David) in which they were already building a fortress. I sent at once a messenger of mine with some letters for the Naique; and afterwards Father Nicholas Levanto, Rector of the College of San Thomé of the Society of Jesus, at my request went over there taking other letters of mine on the same subject. And I caused that the Naique might forbid a fortress to be built by them and might send

The Portuguese, then bitter rivals of the Dutch, exercised much influence at the court of Venkata I, who, when he heard of the construction of the fort at Tegnapatam by the Dutch, sent an envoy to the Nayak of Gingee ordering the expulsion of the Dutch from his territory. It seems that Krishnappa did not obey him first, for in the following year we find Nicholas Levanto deputed by the Bishop of San Thomē, to obtain from Venkata the expulsion of the Dutch from Tegnapatam. Levanto went in person to Venkata's court and easily obtained from him a new order for the Nayak of Gingee to whom he personally presented it. He was also well received by Krishnappa.

Matters were, however, seriously discussed at Krishnappa's court. "The nut was a hard one to crack" says the Jesuit letter, "because of the large profits the Nayak hoped to get from the Dutch." Hence he told the Father to hope for the best, but delayed a

them back out of his possessions, because since they are rebels against your Majesty, they are also so to my person....."

From my kingdom—Ventacja king.....The letter further down says that "the fort (Taunapatam) is very convenient, the town large and the population very numerous, scattered in the other ports and villages of that bay, for instance, Paliacate, Arimagan, Seven Pagodas, which are quite important ports."

definite reply. Venkata issued another letter reprimanding the Nayak for his disobedience and ordering him again to act according to the demand of the Fathers, and to expel from his territory the foes of the Portuguese, "who are better friends than the Dutch."

Krishnappa on receipt of the letter sent for Levanto and ordered that the Devanampatnam (or Tegnapatam) fort was to be delivered to the Portuguese. The letter correspondence between Philip III of Spain and Portugal and Venkata I reveals the friendship of Venkata with the Portuguese. In one of his letters Philip III thanked Venkata for the hospitality and kindness shown to the Jesuit Fathers in their successful attempt to drive away the Dutch from Tegnapatam. In return Venkata wrote the following letter.

"I learnt how the Dutch, rebel subjects of Your Majesty, came to Gingee, to talk with the Nayak and request him for the harbour of Tegnapatam. I sent at once a messenger of mine with letters for the Nayak and later on Father Nicholas Levanto of the College of St. Thomē went at my request to Gingee with my letters on the same subject. I saw the Nayak forbade the building of the fortress by the Dutch and expel them from my possessions, the Dutch being the rebels of Your Majesty and also the same to my person."

Great was the elation of the Portuguese, thanks to Venkata, and the Dutch were grievously disappointed. They again demanded from Krishnappa permission to settle at Tegnapatam and Porto Novo, the new city founded by the Nayak. Again they failed. Probably, it is on account of these constant refusals to allow the Dutch to settle in his territory that Krishnappa is said (in a letter of the Portuguese Viceroy, Francis Vasco de Gama 28th November 1604) to have been very fond of the Portuguese.

Dutch Beginnings in the Gingee Coast

An account of the beginnings of Dutch enterprise on the Gingee coast may come in handy at this place. The Dutch fleet that left Holland in 1607, reached Goa in September of the following year and despatched two yachts to the Coromandel Coast to take the cloth that might be obtained there. De Bitter anchored before Tegnapatam; and the local governor offered a piece of ground to the Dutch for building a house and was inclined to permit them to rebuild an old dilapidated Portuguese fort and to trade with his people in all friendship (September-October 1608). On the 8th October the Dutch yachts touched Kunimèdu on their way to Masulipatam and tried to negotiate for a factory at

that place also. They had to go away quickly for fear of the outbreak of the monsoon. The two ships returned to Tegnapatam in November; and four Dutchmen (Pieter Geritsz Bourgonjie and 3 others) went to Gingee to secure a *cowle* from the Nayak. They reached Gingee on the 26th November and were well entertained by the Nayak, who showed great joy at their arrival and offered them, besides the decayed Portuguese fort, the town of Tegnapatam itself. The Dutch, however, did not wish to accept this offer, but requested that the Nayak would take them under his protection. They secured the following *cowle*:—

“ We promise to Jacob de Bitter, Captain, on behalf of the Admiral Pieter Willemsen Verhoven, to take under our protection the Dutchmen who shall remain in Tegnapatam, and to let build the town, to deny the Portuguese and remain their enemies. Against this, we, Dutchmen, promise to bring all merchandise and to trade with all merchants and that we shall pay 4 per cent for all the goods that we shall bring here except the rice used in the house, and the money on that shall not be paid. We shall also pay 4 per cent on the goods that we take from there except that on what has once been paid, a further payment will not be made. What has been

written above, we promise and swear to guard without breaking in any way. *Amen.* 30th November 1608 in the great town of Gingee.”*

The Dutchmen were left behind at the factory of Tegnapatam under Bourgonjie with 12,000 reals and a quantity of sandalwood and other wares. Bourgonjie expected great profits from the trade and asked for a sum of 3 or 4 thousand *reals of eight* for the building of the castle. Sandalwood and camphor were greatly in demand at the place, and apparently also cloves, nutmegs, mace, green velvet, porcelain, ‘armosignen’ red scarlet and yellow copper (brass?). We read that finding that the dilapidated castle was not fit for them to live in, the Dutch factors secured the permission of the ‘great Aya’ (a eunuch who had great influence in the land, more than the Nayak himself, and ‘in whom the government consisted’) proceeded half a mile inland to a small castle, called Tirupāpuliyūr where they lodged for the time. This castle was built of blue free-stone and “supported on 100 beautiful pillars prettily and very beautifully covered figures (sculptures) and other things.” It was described as

* (Page 81 *Journal of the Madras University*: Vol. IV: No. 1).

“a very beautiful and splendid building.”* The Aya of Gingee assured the Dutch that no toll would be taken from them and helped, though tardily, in securing them dyers and weavers. The building of the fort at Tegnapatam did not however, progress rapidly, though the Aya promised to promote the work. He now tried to persuade them to put off the work of fort-building till the arrival of their next fleet; and he said that “without ammunition the Dutch would not be able to defend it against the Portuguese;” and further that the building was hazardous and the Portuguese would go and complain to the ‘Great King’ (the Raya) who would see with an envious eye the Dutch fort springing up and would only tolerate them as mere traders. The Aya however permitted them to trade for the present from Tirupāpuliūr. Some of the Dutchmen in the lodge at Tirupāpuliūr misbehaved and rebelled against the authority of Bourgonjie and trade diminished (1609). The Aya indeed helped them to remain on the coast against the wishes of the Raya and got over the Nayak of Gingee to his side; and the Portuguese were not able to drive them out of Tirupāpuliūr though they secured

* The building was evidently a temple or a man-tapam at Tirupāpuliūr about two miles inland from Tegnapatam across the Gadilam river which falls into the sea to the south of the factory town.

from the Nayak of Tegnapatam 7 other villages for 1,500 *pardoes* in spite of the Dutch promise made from the beginning to offer double of what the Portuguese might give. The Dutch blamed the Aya for all this; and the Portuguese utilised the material collected by the Dutch for the building; while a Portuguese Jesuit intrigued at the court of Gingee; and the position of the Dutch became very unsatisfactory, as no dyer or weaver was allowed to approach their factory without the special permission the Aya.

But the wheels of fortune turned quickly in favour of the Dutch. In December 1609, the Portuguese were driven away by the Nayak and the Aya for not having kept their promises and “thrust out as if they had been hounds”; but the Dutch knew that they had to be “free with promises of gold to both.” Bourgonjie was not over-anxious to return to Tegnapatam before he should feel his way securely; he resolved to write to the ruler of Kandy for 2 or 3 elephants that would be acceptable to the Nayak as a present. The Dutch had been friendly with the king of Kandy who had sent to the factors at Tirupāpuliyūr a golden ring set with fine blue stones and five sacks of cinnamon by envoys who offered to present annually to the Dutch 10 or 12 elephants to satisfy this Nayak. The Dutch

received similar offers and appeals for help from the king of Jaffnapatam and from the Nayak of Tanjore. Bourgonjie and his officers wrote to the ruler of Tanjore requesting the grant of Tirumalipatam (Tirumalarāyanpattinam) situated between Tirupāpuliūr and Negapatam but received no reply to his letter of request.

When the next Dutch fleet appeared on the coast in the spring of 1610, it was to leave nutmegs, maces, cloves, sandalwood, 'scissick' and other wares and also four 'pigs of iron' with some gunpowder. The *cowle* received by De Bitter about Tegnapatam was to be renewed or a new contract was to be concluded to the total exclusion of the Portuguese. In March 1610, two Portuguese ships of San Thomē were captured and taken to Tegnapatam which had 370 packs (bales) of Coromandelese linen and 25 bars of indigo ready for shipping.

Maertssen who brought the captured ships from San Thomē, negotiated with the great Aya for a new contract which was concluded, on the 29th March 1610, "between the Aya Tiere Wangelaye, governor over the islands Tindamandalam on the one side and Arend Maertssen and Pieter Gerritsz Bourgonjie on the other side." The Aya swore on

his side to keep the contract with his Nayak, Christoppen Aya (Krishnappa Nayak). The Dutch should have within the fortress of Tirupāpuliyūr, as a storehouse of ammunition and merchandise, the house called *Nota Calamatta Coin* and were to furnish the fort with a metal cannon and three iron guns. They should pay 2% import and export duties except for money, rice and other necessities of the fort. The Nayak and the Aya should have the right to buy sulphur from the Dutch and they should compel the dyers and weavers to carry out their agreements with the Dutch and not permit other European nations to trade, without special papers from Prince Maurice. The Aya should be supplied with the goods that he desired from the Netherlands at cost price. The Dutch should not trouble ships sailing with the passport of the captain of Tegnapatam. "Thus the Dutch secured contractual confirmation for their possession of Tirupāpuliyūr and could use Tegnapatam as the harbour for it. Porto Novo also stood open before them, but they did not establish a factory there immediately."

After concluding this treaty with the Aya, Maertssen and a companion, Abraham Fontaine, went to Gingee from whose Nayak they took a letter to the Stadtholder of

Holland, wherein the Aya promised to keep the contract concluded now and requested that ships might be sent to Tegnapatam. Towards the end of April 1610, the Dutch at Tirupāpuliyūr received the Raya's permission to enter into trade negotiations at Pulicat. The contract which had been sent to Vellore from Gingee was ratified by the Raya a few days afterwards. Difficulties were put in the way by the Portuguese who offered 5,000 pagodas to the brother-in-law of the Nayak for driving away the Dutch from Pulicat. In fact, Portuguese opposition continued even after the news of the Twelve Years' Truce of Antwerp reached the coast in the end of 1610.

Tegnapatam became a subordinate factory under the supervision of Pulicat where a fort, called Geldria, was erected. Even as late as 1613, the Portuguese continued to trouble the Dutch factors; they offered 1,000 pagodas to the Aya for driving the Dutch out of the place, and handing over the head of the factory, Vander Meer, to them; and the latter had to pay 2,000 rix dollars to the Aya to secure his safety. Hard stone was conveyed from Tegnapatam to Geldria to be overlaid on the walls of its fort, as the visitor, de Harze thought that the factory caused unnecessary expenditure and proposed to abolish it (1614).

Krishnappa Nayaka—(continued.)

His zeal for Vaishnavism. Krishnappa Nayaka was a loyal follower of Venkata I in his attitude towards religion. He was a staunch Vaishnava like his master and did much to spread and foster it. His measures in the Chidambaram temple are sufficient to show his zeal for Vaishnavism.*

Father Pimenta, the Jesuit traveller who visited Krishnappa Nayaka at his camp in Chidambaram in 1597 A. D., found him then engaged in the settlement of internal disputes among the managers of the temple. The Chidambaram temple is famous for its great and dominant Saiva shrine of Nataraja, and we find in 1597 A. D. a bitter controversy was raging over the question whether the shrine of Vishnu should be included within the innermost enclosure of the temple wherein the shrine of Nataraja was located. The main reason for these controversies had to be attributed to the Vijayanagara monarchs who tried to extend Vaishnavism and who were greatly helped by their Guru Tātāchārya in this task.

It has been said that Vaishnavism reached its high water-mark in South India during

* Vide infra.

the time of Venkata I and it is no wonder that Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee showed great determination in restoring and repairing the Govindaraja shrine within the Nataraja temple. Pimenta has given a succinct account of what he saw at Chidambaram in 1597 A. D. The following is his observation.

“A great controversy arose whether it was lawful to place the sign of Perumal—a Vaishnava—in the Saiva temple at Chidambaram. Some refused while the others importunately urged. The priests of the temple who were the treasurers, were withstanding and threatening, if it were done, to cast down themselves from the top of the temple tower. The Brahmans of the temple swore to do the like after they buried the former. Krishnappa Nayaka was unmoved by such threats and was calmly superintending the repairs that he had ordered at the Vishnu shrine. The construction of the buildings of the shrine was carried on, undaunted by the fierce threats of the opponents. The priests climbed one of the high gopurams of the temple and cast themselves down while the Nayak was there.” Pimenta observed “that twenty people had perished in that precipitation on that day of departure, whereat the Nayak being angry, caused his gunners to shoot at the rest which killed two of them while

others fled to different places. A woman also was so hot in the jealous controversy that she cut her own throat.”* Naturally Krishnappa’s anger and his order to shoot at the rest, while a few of them threw themselves down from the tower top, cannot be justified at all and can be regarded only as a callous exhibition of sectarian bigotry.

To understand the spirit of the Nayak in his attitude towards Vaishnavism, a review of the events of the time is essential.

The history of Chidambaram under the Vijayanagara rulers has largely been a period of acute religious rivalry and sectarian disputes between the Saivites and the Vaishnavites.** The *Prapannāmrtam*, an orthodox Vaishnava work, refers to the Chola King Krimikāṇṭha Kulōttunga,*** who is said to have removed the Govindaraja idol from the Chidambaram temple. The *Kulōttunga Chōlan Ulā* and the *Rāja Rāja Chōlan Ulā* refer to the same king who caused the idol to be thrown into the sea. Sri Ramanuja had then established and consecrated the Govinda-

* Du Jarrio, p. 637; Anquetil du Perron, p. 169 (quoted).

** See Rao Saheb M. Raghava Iyengar in “The Annals of Oriental Research of the University of Madras 1938—39”, Volume III; Part I.

*** Likely Kulōttunga II (See *infra* note.)

raja shrine in the town of Tirupati in the place of the one at Chidambaram that had been de-secrated by the Chola. The later Vaishnava Acharyas had according, to the *Prapannāmr-tam* tried to reconsecrate the deity on a secure basis and translate it to its original shrine with the help of the Vijayanagara Emperors. Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee seems to have been one of such men who tried to restore to its former eminence the old shrine of Govindaraja in the temple.

* Rao Saheb Pandit M. Raghava Iyengar traces the fortunes of the Sri Govindarajaswami shrine in the Chidambaram temple. We know that the deity was praised in song by Tirumangai Ālwār and Kulasēkhara Ālwār from whom we learn that the worship in the shrine was conducted by the Tillai Mūvāyiravar.

The shrine itself is said to have been founded by a Pallava ruler, as Tirumangai Ālwār says:—in *Periya Tirumozhi* (3, 2. 3.)

Again we learn from the *Tirukkōvaiyār* of Mānikka Vāchagar that even in those days the deity in the Vishnu shrine was shaped as the Vishnu recumbent on Ādisēsha and the shrine itself was adjacent to the Siva shrine.

We know further from Vaishnava literature that the Vishnu deity was thrown into sea by the order of a Chola monarch and the shrine itself was pulled down at the time; the work,—*Rāmānujārya Divya Charitai*—of Pillailōkam Jiyar, attributable to the 16th century, tells us that this Chola monarch was Senni Kulōttungan, who can be, with a great degree of probability, identified with Kulōttunga II (A. D. 1135—1146). Ottakkūttan, his

* The Annals of Oriental Research of the Madras University Vol. III, (1938—39) Part I.

court poet, praising his son, Rājarāja, refers to the incident of the idol being thrown into the sea, as an achievement of the father.

Again, in his work, *Takkuyāgapparaṇi*, he makes it plain that Kulōttunga II pulled down the Vishnu shrine to make room for the enlargement of the Siva shrine.

We know that Kulōttunga II was also known by the titles of Anabhāya and Tirunīṟṟu Cholan. The *Rāmānujārja Divya Charita* referred to above, gives, Saka Āyiratt. . . . onpatu as the year of the destruction of the Vishnu shrine. As the Mss. (including even the one in the Madras O. M. Library) show a gap in this place, besides others, and as mere Saka 1009 (A. D. 1087) would only refer to the times of Kulōttunga I, and as the gap is obvious from the metrical structure of the stanza and also from another verse in the same work where we read that four hundred and twelve years before the reconsecration of the temple—which took place, as is shown by an inscription in the first prākāra of the Chidambaram shrine, [No. 272 of 1913, M. E. R.] on the 31st May, 1539 and also Record No. 1 of 1915 M. E. R. (corresponding to Saka 1461—Mithuna month, Saturday, Anurādha Nakshatra) when Achyuta Raya Maharaja of Vijayanagara built anew the shrine of Sri Govindaraja in the ambalam of Perumbaṟṟappuliyūr, reconsecrated the image of the deity and granted villages yielding 500 gold coins for the daily worship etc.—the date of destruction should be Saka 1461—412 = Saka 1049 = A. D. 1127. This date 1049 Saka can easily fit into the mutilated stanza of the work referred to above; and the blank portion made to read as Nārpaṭṭu (forty). This word, meaning one thousand and forty-nine is more fitting to the stanza than either A. D. 1117 or 1137; moreover A. D. 1117 would take us into the reign of Kulōttunga I; while the latter year would bring us to the time of Sri Ramanuja's demise. Ramanuja, we know from other sources, had certainly heard of the desecration of the Vishnu shrine and of the subsequent transportation of the image by some *Bhaktas*

to Lower Tirupati, had gone over to the latter place where he had the image consecrated and afterwards resided at Srirangam for some years before passing away. Hence neither 1117 A. D. nor 1137 A. D. would be suitable; and 1127 A. D. can alone fit in. The only objection is that in 1127 A. D. Vikrama Chola (1117—1136), the father of Kulōttunga II, was ruling; Vikrama is known to have added to the Siva shrine at Chidambaram and made great gifts to it, bringing them to a completion in 1128 A. D. But since many of these gifts are actually sung as having been done by Kulōttunga by Ottakkūttar and since we cannot be certain that Vikrama was personally the instrument of these gifts, it is very probable that Kulōttunga II was acting for his father and in personal charge of the renovations and gifts to the Siva shrine; he was also the crown prince and had been crowned as co-ruler with his father; and he can be well held to be the destroyer of the Vishnu shrine in 1127. The reconsecration of the Vishnu shrine in 1539 was done under the inspiration of a famous Vaishnava teacher of the time, Doddāchārya, *alias* Mahāchārya, of Sholinghur by Ramaraya of Chandragiri, the younger brother of Krishnadevaraya, according to the Sanskrit work, *Prapannamrtam*. This Ramaraya was a lieutenant of Achyuta Raya and not the brother of Krishnadeva Raya. It was Achyuta, the younger brother of Krishnadeva Raya, that did really reconsecrate the shrine. This is further evidenced by Varadaraja, the author of *Vāsudēvacharitai* or *Baghavatam* in which he praised the deity, Govindaraja, as the God Vishnu worshipped by the Devas with Uma's Lord dancing by the side who was restored to his former shrine and worshipped by Achyutaraya in some verses.

Achyuta Raya built the several parts of the Vishnu shrine; and we learn from the *pāyiram* of the *Vāsudēvacharitai*, that it was published in Saka 1465 = A. D. 1543. It is plain that the words used by Varadaraja refers to the fact that the Vishnu shrine was built, after four centuries of non-existence, after the old model. Perhaps Varadaraja might have actually witnessed this restoration, as he published his work 4 years after that date. In Saka 1565, *i.e.* A. D. 1643, Srirangaraya, the Aravidu ruler, renovated the *mahāmantapa* and the

The first three dynasties of rulers of Vijayanagara had been tolerant of both religions. Krishnadevara Raya of the Tuluva line, though he professed Vaishnavite leanings, is not known to have made any gifts to Govindaraja. An inscription of Achyuta Maharaya refers to the fact that he ordered the Govindaraja image in, Vaḷudilambattu Chavadi, *i. e.*, Chidambaram, to be set up according to the Vaikhānasa Sūtra ritual and granted 500 *pon*, the income from four villages, for the upkeep of daily worship." With royal and gubernatorial support the Govindaraja shrine came into restored prominence.*

vimāna over the sanctum of the goddess in the Vishnu shrine and gave away five villages in rent-free grant for the benefit of the Sri Vaishnavas of the place (Inscription No. 271 of 1913). Thus, in or about the 8th century, the Vishnu shrine was consecrated by a Pallava ruler; in the first half of the 12th century, it was destroyed by a Chola; in the 16th century it was renovated by a Vijayanagara Emperor and further enlarged by one of his successors in the 17th century. In 1934, the ruined hall in front of the shrine and the shrine itself which was dilapidated were renovated at a considerable cost through the munificent generosity of the well-known South Indian philanthropist, Raja Sir Annamalai Chettiar of Chettinad.

* During the period of the Araviḍu line of Vijayanagara rulers, religious controversies became prominent and several polemics took place between the champions of two creeds, Appayya Dikshita and Mahāchārya or Doddāchārya, who established the image of Govindaraja at Chidambaram with the help of Tātāchārya. Appayya Dikshita was a *protégé* of Chinna Bomma Nayaka of Vēlūr according to the record at Adaipalaṁ

(Kālakantēswara shrine). According to that inscription we find that Chinna Bomma's fame spread far and wide because of his association with Appayya Dikshita who established the superiority of Siva and identified it with the Godhead by raising *Sri Kanta Bhashya* from its obscurity. It was natural therefore that the Vaishnavites also indulged in these disputes. According to the *Prapannāmrtam*, the Vaishnava scholar Mahāchārya defeated in disputes the Siva scholars of Chidambaram among whom was mentioned Appaya Dikshita. Later on Mahāchārya is said to have established the Govindaraja shrine in the temple of Chidambaram during the reign of Rama Raya.

The zeal displayed by Tātāchārya in the cause of Vaishnavism naturally enraged the Saivas and disputes arose among the Saiva and Vaishnava scholars at the Vijayanagara court. In one of the controversies between Tātāchārya and Appayya Dikshita, the latter seems to have won the dialectical victory. Another such controversy took place at Kumbhakonam between the philosopher, Vijayindra Tirtha, and a famous Vira Saiva Guru of that Matha in which the latter lost and had to hand over the mutt to Vijayindra in accordance with the previous arrangements. Vijayindra Tirtha in his several discussions with Appaya Dikshita had refuted the Saiva arguments. Such was the antagonism that prevailed between the two sects especially in the Tamil country; and Krishnappa Nayaka's attitude at Chidambaram can be reckoned only as representing the spirit of the times.

Venkata I also favoured the cult of Siva for he partronised Appayya Dikshita and it was he who was responsible for his work on Alankāra known as *Kuvālayānanda*. Venkata had also distributed offerings to the Saiva mendicants in the temple of Chidambaram. His plate of the year 1596 contains a large number of mythological figures of both Vishnu and Siva. In spite of this eclecticism of Venkata, one cannot doubt the great favour enjoyed by Vaishnavism and its successful extension during his reign.

However, the whole Empire was not Vaishnava. The Nayakas of Vellore remained faithful to Siva,

Tirumala Tātāchārya. The most revered teacher and scholar at his (Venkata's) court was undoubtedly the Tātāchārya of tradition. His full name was Ettūr Kumara Tirumala Tātāchārya. He was also known as Lakshmi-Kumāra and Kōtikanyādāna, evidently suggesting the countless virgins he had given away in marriage to learned Brahmans. In one record, he is called Venkatarāya Tātāchārya, the Tātāchārya whom king Venkata revered. Several inscriptions attest to his great influence at Venkata's court. He was the royal guru and officiated at the king's coronation. The king, in the excess of his admiration, is said to have offered him his whole kingdom. He was the manager of the Vaishnava temples at Kanchi, where a number of inscriptions mentioning him have been found on the walls of the Arulala Perumal temple. In 1570 A. D. he got the *vimana* at Tirupati gilded. He weighed himself against gold and silver and used all that wealth in the service of God Varadaraja of Kanchi in erecting the Kalyāṇakoti Vimana in gold for the Goddess

Chinna Bomma Nayaka being raised to fame by Appayya Dikshita. Lingama Nayaka, his successor, was also engaged in establishing the Linga of Siva according to the Vīlpaka grant of Venkata. The Nayaks of Ikkeri had titles which mean the establishers of the pure Advaita doctrine and devotion to the faith of Siva and the guru. They had even converted some Jainas to the Saiva creed.

Lakshmi in that famous temple. His gifts of vehicles for the temples, jewels for the deities, and *agrahārās* for Brahmans, and his digging of the tank, called Tātasamudram after himself, are mentioned in one epigraph in glowing terms. The Kalyāṇakōti-Vimāna was finished about 1614 A. D., and was evidently built in emulation of the Puṇyakōti-Vimāna set up by King Krishnadeva Raya. The latter was repaired by Tātāchārya and regilded by him as it had decayed. There is also a record registering the *Hanumad-Vimsati*, a poem of 20 verses composed by him in honour of God Hanuman, whose image he set up in the temple on the bank of Tātasamudram tank, now known familiarly as the Ayyankuḷam, dug by him. According to an inscription on the bund of the Tennēri Tank, Chingleput District, it seems to have been dug by Tātāchārya. He is probably identical with the Tātārya, mentioned in a record dated in 1590 A. D. as the grandson of Ettur Tātārya and son of Srinivasa. This record registers the grant of a village called Venkatesapura in his favour. His forbears had been connected with the spread of Sri Vaishnavism; and the family claimed descent from Śrissīlanātha, the uncle of the great reformer, Sri Rāmanuja. He is called, in the Daḷavai-Agraharam grant, as “the ornament

of the wise.” “A well-known philosophical work of his is *Sātvikabrahma-Vidya-Vilāsa*. A work of the same name in Kannada by Ranga Raja, a Sri Vaishnava poet who lived at the court of Chikka Deva Raja, is known. (See R. Narasimhacharya, *Karnataka-Kavi-charite*, II, 449—50). It is probably based on Tātāchārya’s work. He also wrote a work called *Pānduranga-mahātmya* devoted to the Vittala temple at Pandharpur in the present Bombay Presidency. This work, however, should be distinguished from the Telugu work of the same name, the author of which was Tenāli Ramakrishnakavi referred to below. The influence of Tātāchārya was evidently felt even by the Jesuit Fathers at the court of Venkata. One of these, Father Coutinho, seems to have entirely misunderstood the great teacher.” (Pp. 2223-2225 of the *Mysore Gazetteer*, (New Edition) Vol. II, Part III).

From inscriptions we know that Tātāchārya’s dates range from Saka 1496 (1574—75 A. D.) to Saka 1552 (1630 A. D.). Two of his ancestors had obtained the favour of king Virupaksha II and lived at his court, according to the *Prapannāmrtam*.

CHAPTER IV

The Rule of Krishnappa Nayaka—(continued)

The death of the Vijayanagara Emperor, Venkata I, in 1614 A. D. led to a tragic civil war between the feudal adherents of the legal claimant to the throne headed by Yachama Nayaka, and the supporters of the putative son of Venkata headed by the infamous Jagga Raya. One of the allies of Jagga Raya was Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee, who, with Muthu Virappa Nayaka of Madura, espoused the wrong cause and suffered in the end.*

* We have read that about 1586 A. D. Krishnappa Nayaka, the Nayak of Gingee, appears to have rebelled against Venkata I. Troops were marched against him under one Venkata, a brother of Ankabhūpāla, the Kalahasti chief, and he was brought a prisoner, probably to Penukonda, and there confined; and Venkata was evidently put in charge of it. Raghunatha Nayak of Tanjore secured his release, and the grateful Krishnappa offered his daughter in marriage to Raghunatha. Krishnappa was evidently a wise ruler, and kept his capital Gingee, in an excellent condition. The Jesuit letters speak highly of its strength and wealth and refer to it as the "Troy of the East". He founded a town near Porto Novo, called Krishnapatam after himself. Among his subordinates were Lingama Nayaka of Vellore; the Nayaka of Tiruvati, near Panruti in the South Arcot district; and the Sōlaga, who figures in the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* and the *Sāhityaratnākara*. About 1600 he refused to pay the customary tribute and Venkata I was about to send an army against him, when the news of his insanity which was, however, a pretence, prevented the Raya from taking such a step. Krishnappa sent an embassy in 1604 to Ven-

kata; but nothing evidently came of it; and war was declared in 1607; and Yachama Nayak, the Vēlugōti chief, was probably in command of the forces, as the *Vēlugōtivāri*—*Vamśāvali* states that he captured Gingee in the reign of Venkata I. Krishnappa was taken prisoner and Venkata advanced from Vellore and obtained his submission in person.

About 1603, Lingama Nayaka, son of Chinna Bomma Nayaka of Vellore, rebelled. He was loyal up to 1601, when, at his request, the Vilapaka grant was made. Lingama appears to have chafed at his dependence on the Nayak of Gingee and even on Venkata himself. He had amassed immense wealth and had the fort at Vellore, which, even then, was reputed to be one of the strongest and most beautiful of its kind known in Southern India. Venkata sent out his Dalavay, who was evidently Damarla Chenna of the Kalahasti family. He advanced rapidly to attack and storm the fort; but he was early opposed on the way at a place called Munnali (or Minnal) by Lingama's forces which he defeated. He then pushed on with a view to reach Vellore unexpectedly at the dawn of the following day. But his forces lagged behind; and the advance storming party met with a warm fire from the defenders. Chenna had to retreat; but, undaunted, he again invested the fortress, despite the prevailing rains. The siege dragged on for a couple of months; and at the end, Lingama was eventually taken prisoner by a stratagem, almost at the very gates of his fortress. Negotiations began with a view to induce Chenna to abandon even the siege operations. But the twenty lakhs that were offered to him would not tempt him. He sent word to Venkata that this was the time to fill his coffers and annex this strongly fortified town. Venkata hastened to the spot in January, 1604, with a large army and a number of camp followers and elephants. Lingama received him with due humility, but his sons still kept up a continuous fire and endeavoured their utmost to prevent Venkata from entering the city. But all was of no use. Vellore at last surrendered and Venkata Raya and his queen took up their residence "in the marble palace of Lingama Nayaka adorned with gold and precious stones."

Though Venkata had six wives, he had no issue by any one of them. The senior consort, Vayyāmbika, anxious to secure the rule for herself, contrived, according to Barradas, to appear as having become *enceinte* and given birth to a male child, which was in reality, a child born to a Brahman woman of the palace. Venkata I was evidently unaware of this fraud at that time, and accepted the child as his own for “the love he bore the queen”, and even made the child the crown prince. But before his death, he had changed his mind and nominated his nephew as his successor.

The nephew who was called Sri Ranga was very weak and unfit to rule and failed to justify his choice. Barradas distinctly states that the new king displeased three of his great nobles, who had been secretly plotting with Jagga Raya and who with the help of other allies forced the Raya to surrender and crowned his own nephew, the putative prince. All the nobles and feudatories of the empire

Vellore itself became a second royal residence from about 1606. This fact is mentioned in the *Rāmarājyamu* though not registered in contemporary inscriptions. Several Jesuit letters, however, confirm this statement of the *Rāmarājyamu*. Evidently it was not treated as the formal capital of the empire, though used as a royal residence by Venkata I. Hence the sobriquet it still enjoys as *Rāya-Vēlūru*, i.e., the Vellore of the Raya (i.e., Venkata I), who first took up his residence in it.

rendered homage to the new ruler, except Yachama Nayaka, the leader of the loyalists, who refused to acknowledge the usurper and courted a war. Yachama Nayaka, was the chief of Venkatagiri *; and he stood firmly by the side of Sri Ranga. He succeeded in securing one of the sons of Sri Ranga, by a curious device through the washerman of the palace. According to the *Rāmarājyamu*, the *Sūhityaratnākara* and the *Raghunāthābyudhayam*, the rescued boy was called Rama. The barbarous action of Jagga Raya in slaying the king and the royal family, caused a serious reaction, and many deserted him and joined Yachama Nayak. A fierce battle took place between Jagga Raya and the allies at

* Yachama Nayak was of the twentieth generation of the Vēlugōti family. According to 'A Family History of Venkatagiri Rajas' by Alladi Jaganatha Sastri, (1922) he was famous for two military achievements—one, in a battle of 1602 at Uttara Mallur, when he put to flight a number of enemies and the second in another fight when he espoused the cause of his Vijayanagar *protegē*. Yachama Nayak would not side Jagga Raya, but helped in the escape of a prince of the royal family, all of whom were imprisoned by Jagga Raya; the boy was 12 years of age, and was smuggled in a bundle of soiled linen. This boy was later on acclaimed emperor; and Yachama took the crown and royal ornaments of his father as booty from Jagga Raya's camp. The description given by Kalahasti Damarla Vengala Bhūpala, in his Telugu work, "*Bahulāsva-charitram*" bears ample testimony to the military and victorious career of Yacha Sura and to many other victories at Uttara Mallur, Chingleput, Pālayamkōttai, Madura, Gingee and Trichinopoly.

Toppur (near the Grand Anicut) in 1617 A. D. where Jagga Raya had fled with his putative nephew. Rama Deva II, the only surviving son of Sri Ranga, was then proclaimed king.*

* Venkata had two of his young nephews, the sons of his brother Rama, the viceroy at Srirangapatnam brought up at his court and near his person. When his brother Rama, the viceroy died, Venkata sent the elder of his two sons, to succeed his father in the viceroyalty and kept the younger, called Ranga or Sriranga, with him. Venkata seems also to have early designed him for the succession to himself and brought him up virtually as his heir—presumptive; even giving him the title of Chikkaraya, which, as it was understood at the time, meant the heir-presumptive. One of his queens, however, who remained childless, and was believed to be so even by Venkata himself, apparently cherished other ambitions and produced a baby, which she claimed to be her own child, and which she brought up in the palace as her son, without Venkata doing anything to prevent the course, with the result that she was strengthened in the belief that she had the countenance of the Emperor, in regard to the presumptive claim of this putative boy to the throne. On his death-bed, however, Venkata, notwithstanding the protests—whether sincere or not, we are not certain—of Prince Ranga, his nephew, nominated him as his successor and thus brought about a conflagration, which well nigh destroyed the Empire completely.

The queen who claimed to have a son, belonged to the powerful family of the Gobburu chiefs; and her brother, Jagga Raya, was, perhaps also in consequence of his relationship to the Raya, the most powerful nobleman of the Empire, and, possessed of the largest resources in the state, was next only to the Emperor. He probably found it would be more advantageous to himself, and would meet the needs of his own ambition better, if the putative boy-nephew of his, were placed on the throne instead of Ranga, who had received already some training as prince and was said to possess a mind of his own and expected to take his own line in the government of the Empire. Immediately after the

installation of Ranga, Jagga Raya started a movement, trying to enlist the nobles of the Empire on his side, as many as was possible.

This attempt to set aside the succession of Ranga, gradually developed to the extent of a great many of the feudatories of rank in the Empire joining Jagga, and left the new Emperor Ranga without the help of chieftains of rank, with the exception of one doughty champion of his obviously forlorn cause in Vēlūgōti Yachama Nayaka, the real founder of the family of Venkatagiri.

Jagga Raya was able gradually to surround the palace and set his own guards over the new Raya, making him entirely powerless in the administration and later actually imprisoning him in one of his palaces under his own guard; he then proclaimed his own nephew to be the rightful Emperor, instead of Ranga who had ascended the throne. This was opposed single-handed by Yachama Nayaka, who gradually developed his resources and strengthened his party by gaining a few allies; thus began the great war of succession in Vijayanagar. It took two years of confusion and anarchy in the land before the fateful struggle could come to a final decision. It was the massacre of the royal family that precipitated the war, Jagga Raya having ordered the wholesale murder, in cold blood, of Ranga and all his family who were practically his prisoners. Before the day appointed for the purpose, Yachama Nayaka had, however, managed cleverly to secure the possession of Ranga's second son, by name Rama, who was about ten or twelve years of age—the elder brother being too grown up for the purpose of concealment—as the arrangement was that a washerman was to smuggle the boy out of the fort in his bundle of soiled linen. After a number of skirmishes, the war was ultimately decided at the fateful and decisive battle of Tōppūr, the village now being called Tōhūr and situated quite close to the Grand Anicut on the southern bank of the Kaveri. Among the principal governors of the empire, the Nayaka of Tanjore was the only one that remained loyal, all the other Nayaks having joined the side of Jagga Raya. The battle went against Jagga Raya, who also fell in the field; and this young prince Rama was installed as Emperor by

The great civil war of Vijayanagara lasted from 1614 to 1617 and caused a considerable dislocation. The short-lived rule of Ranga II, son of the brother of Venkata, has not got much interest for us. Queyroz tells us that "he was a prudent man"; and he was, indeed, at first anxious to renounce his rights and retire into peaceful obscurity and not become the cause of bloodshed which, he foresaw, was bound to ensue after the death of Venkata. Ranga had spent time before his enthronement in Tanjore, where he had made the acquaintance of several Vellālas of Jaffnapatam and whom he now appointed to various posts in his service. This act of his caused much discontent among the old nobles of the court. It is considered by Manuel Barradas, who is one of the chief sources of our information and was the Provincial of the

Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore at Kumbakonam, where there is a temple built to God Rama in memorial thereof. This Rama Raya, who was a mere boy at the time of his fateful accession to the throne, ruled over Vijayanagar down to the year 1630, his father Ranga having hardly been Raya for more than a month after his accession. When he was installed in due form as the undisputed Emperor in 1616 or 1617, he could count upon the support of Raghunatha Nayaka of Tanjore, who officiated at his accession, and the loyal chieftain, Yachama Nayaka, with, perhaps, a few more chiefs of comparatively minor rank. All the other feudatories of the Empire were up in arms, or at least had compromised themselves by taking up arms against him, and it was a question of almost conquering the Empire over again, before it could be brought into effective loyalty to him.

Jesuit Province of Malabar and whose account was published by R. Sewell in his 'Forgotten Empire', Chapter XVII,* that Ranga compelled some of the captains of his army to leave the fortress (probably Vellore) and kept others by his side; and it was this action that is held to have precipitated the rebellion of Jagga Raya, who was one of the three chiefs who did not pay homage to him at the time of his accession. According to Barradas, he could put 20,000 men into the field and had a revenue of 600,000 cruzados. He was assisted by Timma Naique who had territories yielding 400,000 cruzados of revenue and kept an army of 12,000 men. The third of the chief conspirators was Macaraju (Makaraja), who had a revenue of 200,000 cruzados and could muster in the field 6,000 men and who has been identified with one of the Karvetinagar chiefs by Mr. H. Krishna Sastri.** These three chiefs spread the rumour that the new emperor Ranga did not belong at all to the Aravidu family, but had been fraudulently imposed on the kingdom. They first concealed their disaffection till the Raya had openly alienated the three prominent captains of the kingdom, namely, the Daḷavāy,

* From letter dated Cochin, December 12, 1616 A.D. and found in the National Archives at Lisbon.

** H. Krishna Sastri's 'The Third Vijayanagara Dynasty,' : *Archæological Survey of India Report for 1911—1912*, p. 188, note 3).

the Minister and one Narapa Razu, who was a brother of the widow of the late king. There were also other nobles, besides these six, involved in the conspiracy. When their plot had matured, Jagga, Timma and Maka contrived to enter the fort with large bodies of armed men. Jagga Raya left 1,000 men at the first gate and another body of 1,000 at the second gate, while the Dalavay seized two other gates on the other side of the fort. He then compelled Ranga to make a promise to surrender and pledged his word to him that he would do him no ill. Soon Ranga left the tower in which he was staying, with his wife and children, as Jaggaraya insisted that his nephew must be crowned king, he being the son of the late monarch.

According to the *Raghunāthābhyudayam*, Jagga Raya's rebellion took place after the new emperor had ruled for some time, perhaps about a month or more. The crowning of the usurper by Jagga Raya probably took place in the fort of Vellore. We are told that Jagga Raya found a great quantity of jewels and precious stones in the palace; but his action is indicative of his political talents. He first attempted to reconcile the deposed monarch to his new position because, according to Queyroz, he gave half the imperial revenue to him and treated him with great con-

sideration. Yachama Nayak was the only one of the chiefs at the capital, who refused to join Jagga Raya. He was known by the names of Pedda Yachama Naidu and Yacha Surudu. His brother-in-law as noted above, dedicated to him the poem, *Bahulāsva-charitram*, from which we gather details about him. Yachama Nayak now took the field with his army numbering about 8,000 soldiers, in spite of all persuasions on the part of Jagga. He attempted to obtain access to the imprisoned emperor and, by means of a contrivance, got hold of the second son of the latter, aged about twelve years, secreting and conveying him in a bundle of washerman's cloths. The above mentioned Jesuit account of the rescued prince Rama, who later on was placed on the throne after the civil war which ended in a complete victory for Yachama and his ally, is confirmed by the *Rāmarājīyam*, by the *Sāhityaratnākara** and by the *Raghu-nāthābhyudayam*. Jagga Raya was greatly depressed by the escape of this prince; and as a consequence, he doubled the guard set over the deposed emperor and even subjected him to partial starvation. But soon there arose numerous defections from his camp to Yachama Nayaka's side. Failing in all his attempts

* This work mentions Yachama Nayak as Yacha Bhūpati and Yacha Mahipa (Canto XIII, Slokas 76 and 78).

at escape, the unfortunate emperor was killed by his captors. There are different accounts of his end which was accompanied by the slaying of his elder son and even of his little daughter, mainly through the instrumentality of China Oba Raya, the younger brother of Jagga.* A letter from the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa to King Philip III, dated December 31, 1614, announces the fact of the regicide and this might have taken place a short time before, being confirmed by epigraphic testimony.

After the murder of Ranga and his family, confusion intensified everywhere; and, according to the testimony of Barradas, many of the remaining loyal chiefs went over to the side of Yachama. Jagga's army was thoroughly defeated, the royal insignia were taken from him and the prince (second son of Ranga), who had been already rescued from his hands, was proclaimed as the rightful king. Jagga and his partisans were forced to take refuge in the forest. The *Bahulāsvacharitam* mentions the younger brother of Yachama and his brother-in-law Chenna and says that the latter fought with the Nayaka of

* According to Barradas, the poor king with his own hand beheaded his wife and his little daughter and then killed himself by falling upon his sword. His eldest son killed his wife in a similar manner and then put an end to his own life.

Madura, who was persuaded to join Jagga after his defeat. Chenna was the captain-general of the army of the loyalists, who now requested the Nayak of Tanjore to take up the cause of the rightful prince Rama. After some negotiations, in the course of which Yachama Nayak proceeded on his way to Tanjore to get the assistance of Raghunatha, we learn from the *Raghunāthābhyaudayam* that the traitors to the empire had effected a junction with the rulers of Tundira (Gingee) and Pandya (Madura) and with their armies were hunting for the late emperor's surviving son to put him to death.

The *Sāhityaratnākara* further says that the Pārasīkas (Portuguese?) were allied with the Nayak of Madura in favour of the nephew of Jagga Raya. Father Heras denies that the Portuguese joined the war at all on the ground that if they had done so, both Barradaś and the Viceroy of Goa, would have mentioned it. Perhaps, the *Pārasīkas* might have merely meant a body of Mussalman soldiers. Barradas records towards the end of his account which was, however, not published by Sewell, an actual agreement of this body with the party of the young king. The particular war to which this has reference is doubtful.

Raghunathā, the loyal Nayak of Tanjore, who was a bosom friend of Ranga II and had helped him on previous occasions, immediately joined the party of the loyalists and proceeded to Kumbakonam to effect a junction with the legitimate ruler and to celebrate his coronation at that holy place on the Kaveri. Raghunatha then entrusted his kingdom to the charge of his famous minister, Gōvinda Dīkshita, and took a solemn vow to proceed against the treacherous Pandya and his allies (i.e., Muthuvīrappa Nayak, Jagga Raya and others.) The Nayak of Gingee, Krishnappa, was one of the allies of Jagga Raya. His name, however, is not mentioned by Barradas; but both the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* and the *Bahulāsvacharitam* mention this piece of information.

Thus the three great Nayaks of the Tamil country were involved in this momentous civil war, which commenced towards the end of 1614 or in the beginning of 1615 and lasted up to the end of 1616, since Barradas, writing at the end of 1616, distinctly says that “the war was continued these two years.” From the beginning, the legitimist party gradually gained strength and the Nayak of Madura cut the great dam across the Kaveri in order to prevent the enemy from advancing

further south.* Jagga Raya was wandering with his forces near Srirangam when this action was done. Barradas states that at the end of 1616, the Nayak of Tanjore, though not so powerful and resourceful as the Madura Nayak, was “with the aid of the young king setting the upper hand” and the legitimists had assembled in large numbers in the open plains round Trichinopoly. Raghunatha Nayak marched with his army to Tōppūr (or Tōhūr), situated on the southern bank of the Kaveri about two miles west of the great anicut. He first encamped at the village of Paḷamānēri** and prepared for battle and on the next morning gave fight to the enemy, after arranging his cavalry in semicircular formation. “The troops of the Pandya (the Nayak of Madura) could not stand the attack, broke and fled from the field.” Then Jagga Raya became enraged with fury on seeing the defeat of his ally and advanced against Raghunatha of Tanjore. The sight of the

* The *Sāhityaratnākara* (Canto XIII, 78 and 83) says that some-one should have broken the dam at the instigation of Jagga Raya. Ramabhadramba, the authoress of the *Raghunāthābhyudayam*, distinctly says that the dam should have been cut up by the rulers of the west. (*Raghunāthābhyudayam*, Canto IX, 26.)

** The *Raghunāthābhyudayam* of Vijayaraghava fixes the date of this encampment in the cyclic year Nala, month Ashada, Suddha Panchami—August 1616. There was probably an interval before the actual battle took place.

traitor Jagga Raya advancing to attack him in person, made Raghunatha furious. The infantry of the legitimists, checked Jagga Raya's advance. A bloody fight ensued. In the course of the struggle, Jagga Raya and some of his relatives and attendants were killed by the spears of the Tanjore infantry. Jagga Raya's death was the signal for a general flight of the rebel army. Krishnappa Nayak of Gingee also fled from the battlefield, "making himself ridiculous in the eyes of his officers."* The Madura Nayak was one of the last to abandon his post and fought on till many of the important officers under him had fled. Then he began to grow anxious for his personal safety and fled from the field for the distance of a league, but was captured by the soldiers of Raghunatha Nayak and brought before him. Raghunatha pardoned his rival of Madura, "gaining great glory by the act." Then he ordered a pillar of victory to be erected on the banks of the Kaveri. The battle of Tōppūr was fought between December 1616 when Barradas finished his account and November 1617 which is the date of Father Rubino's letter, mentioning Jagga Raya's death, some months before; probably it took place in the first half of 1617. Jagga Raya's brother, by name Yatiraja, now headed

* See the *Raghunāthābhyudayam*.

the rebel party, joined the Nayak of Gingee and others and prepared again to offer battle to Raghunatha. The Tanjore Nayak quickly despatched an army under one of his generals to attack the Gingee territory and the fortresses in it. This army quickly captured Bhuvanagiri, a few miles to the north-west of Chidambaram, on the banks of the Vellar and also some other fortresses in the neighbourhood. He then encountered the army of Krishnappa Nayaka in battle and obtained a great victory. Yatiraja continued to resist the legitimate emperor for some time longer; and according to the *Bahulasvacharitam*, Yachama Nayak, the protector of the emperor, indeed won a victory over Yatiraja in the neighbourhood of Pālayamkōttai in the Chidambaram Taluk of the South Arcot district. This shows that the campaigns of 1617, after the death of Jagga Raya were mainly fought in the region subject to the Gingee Nayak. A reconciliation was effected between Raghunatha and the Madura Nayak who offered one of his daughters in marriage to the former, according to the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* of Vijayaraghava. The drama, *Raghunathavilāsa Nātakam*, tells us of the fact that the Nayaks of Madura and Tanjore effected a family union and subsequently recognised the son of the murdered Sriranga as the rightful

emperor. The Nayak of Gingee probably presented his homage to the new ruler about the same time; for he is said to have ruled over his state in complete peace after these events. Yatiraja, the rebel brother of Jagga Raya, himself seems to have submitted to the legitimate king and ruled over a petty principality in the neighbourhood of Pulicat.*

Effect of the civil war on the strength of the Empire and on the position of the Nayaks

“This war was extremely disastrous for the country. Naturally three years of continuous fighting tended to impoverish the whole kingdom. Both the Portuguese and English records, which we shall quote later on, speak of the miserable state of agriculture and the meagre efforts of trade. Besides, the famous thieves of the forests between Madura and

* Yatiraja figured to a prominent degree in the events of Carnatic in the subsequent decades. He took up his brother's cause and rose to prominence as the chief of the territories that took in Pulicat and Armagaon which Yachama tried to retain effectively in his own hands. Gradually King Rama and Yachama, his guardian, consolidated their position, though we hear of wars in the neighbourhood of Pulicat between Yachama Nayak and Gobburi Yatiraja in 1622. As a measure of reconciling himself with Yatiraja, King Rama married a daughter of his who is described as the second wife of the Raya. Yatiraja had plenty of trouble with the European powers, settled on the coast of his dominions, *viz.*, the Dutch at Pulicat and the Portuguese at San Thomé.

the Marava country became very bold when they saw the rulers of the land engaged in waging war among themselves. The devastations in the Madura country were as calamitous as the war itself. They even dared to maraud the villages round the capital itself. A Jesuit letter informs us that it was very dangerous to go from place to place, for the public roads were so infested with the miscreants that everybody was afraid of losing not only their fortunes, but their very lives." (*Journal of Indian History*, Vol. V ; page 186).

Yachama Nayaka, the real hero of this civil war, deserved the title of the 'Father' of his country and the 'Saviour' of the empire. According the collection of stray verses called *Chatupadya Ratnakaram*, "a crore of Jagga Raya, 70 crores of Maka Raja's father and one lakh and sixteen of Ravilla Venka's put together, would not be a match for Yacha, who bore the title of Ibbaraganda just as any number of goats joining together would not be a match for the tiger." We do not also hear much of Yachama Nayak subsequent to this war, except that Venkatagiri, the headquarters station of the family, was put into the possession of Yachama on the successful execution of this mission. Yachama was the son of Kasturi Rangappa and first ruled over

Perimidi with his capital at Madurantakam. He is famous for his two military achievements, *viz.*, the battle of Uttaramallur in 1602 in which he defeated Pedda Nayudu, with the help of his younger brother, Sarvagna Singama Naidu; and the battle of Toppur. He also distinguished himself by victories in Chingleput, Palayamkottai, Gingee and Trichinopoly.

When Krishnappa Nayaka rebelled in the early part of the reign of Venkata I in 1604, he was put into prison by the latter. Then Raghunatha who was at that time the crown prince of Tanjore, marched to Penukonda to help the Emperor against a Muhammadan invasions and, in return for his help, secured the release a Krishnappa Nayaka. As a mark of gratitude for his kind intervention, Krishnappa Nayaka gave one of his daughters in marriage to Raghunatha. In spite of the service thus rendered to him by Raghunatha, Krishnappa Nayaka allied himself with Jagga Raya and the rebel party on the outbreak of the civil war of succession. For this act of ingratitude to his ally and to his overlord, Krishnappa met with much misfortune that he fully deserved.

We have no definite information as to whether Krishnappa Nayak of Gingee render-

ed homage to the new Emperor, Rama Deva. An inscription* acknowledges the overlordship of Rama Deva to be in the cyclic year 1644 A. D. We can assume that Krishnappa Nayaka and, later, his son rendered homage to Rama Deva who was established on the throne by the efforts of Raghunatha Nayaka.

The Later Nayaks of Gingee

The successors of Krishnappa Nayak were insignificant. According to the Mackenzie Mss. we hear of two Nayaks by name Varadappa Nayak and Appayya Nayak who were merely noted for their imbecility. An inscription of Tirupparankundram, in Madura district, refers to Varadappa Nayaka of Gingee who gave some land and a golden planguin (Amdala) to God Kumaraswami on his was back from Sethu Rameswaram whither he had gone on pilgrimage. There is another inscription in Telugu (860, of 1918) of the same place referring to the same Nayak. The date given in the inscriptions is Saka 1593 (A. D. 1670-71). This date cannot be accepted in view of the fact that the Muhammadans occupied Gingee some years before this event, about 1660 A. D. Probably the Nayak

* Page 172, Vol. I, Rangachari—*Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency*, No. 359 of Vala (Bala Venkatapathy Naicken, son or descendant of Vala Krishnappa Nayakan dated Saka 1386 = A. D. 1464.

enjoyed merely the nominal title. The last of the Nayaks, i.e., Appa Nayak, has been described as weak and extremely vicious and as one who was responsible for the easy conquest of Gingee by the Muhammadans. "Taylor's *Catalogue Raisonné of Mss.* (Vol. III, page 31)"* refers to the *Chenji Rajākkal Kaifaiyat* which conciously endeavoured to glorify the heroism of the last of the rulers of Gingee who headed his troops in person and when he found himself deserted by them, rode on alone and unsupported into the ranks of the enemy, dealing destruction around him until he was overpowered and slain. The liberality of the Nayak and his wife is also lauded in the *Kaifaiyat*.

* XI. Historical, 2. No. 2293. *Chenji Rajakkal Kaifaiyat*. Old No. 232, C. M. 98, Kings of Gingee.

"This is a Ms. of twenty-eight palm leaves, damaged by worms. It is written in Tamil verse of an easy kind. Its chief object is to celebrate the heroism of the last of the *rajas* of Gingee, of the dynasty, proceeding from the original viceroy from Vijayanagaram. The final defence of the fort of Gingee was very obstinate. According to this poem the *raja* headed his troops in person, and whom he found himself no longer supported by them, he rode among the Mahomedans, dealing destruction around him, until overpowered and slain. This rashness the writer magnifies into extraordinary heroism.

The liberality of the king and his queen, in gifts, is greatly lauded in this poem."

CHAPTER V

The Musalman Conquest of Gingee.

(1639—59)

The Nayaks of Gingee and Madura had already played an inglorious but substantial part in the civil war of 1614-17 against the loyalists. After Muthu Virappa Nayaka of Madura, the famous Tirumala Nayaka came to power. He is held to have begun to rule, perhaps from 1623 or 1624, though Virappa died only in 1627 and he became actual ruler in his own right only in 1627-28. Tirumala Nayak of Madura asserted his independence by refusing to pay his tribute to Sri Ranga III. According to the letter of Fr. Proenza, dated A. D. 1659, the Nayaks of Madura had been unpunctual in the payment of tribute; and now Tirumala Nayak refused to pay it altogether having resolved to free himself entirely from every kind of imperial control.* Tirumala's policy towards his overlord was in the first instance, to humour him with occasional presents while desisting from

* The ambition of Tirumala was based on the example of Raja Udayar of Mysore, who captured Seringapatam in 1610 and put an end to the imperial viceroyalty; and it was also, in one aspect, a continuation of the policy of Muthu Virappa who cherished the ambition of independence against the Empire which became weaker, as Madura gained in strength.

paying any regular tribute. After his war with Mysore and the invasion of Travancore, Tirumala naturally turned against the Emperor. The subordination of the Madura Nayak to Venkata at the time of the issue of the Kūniyūr Plates in A. D. 1634 (*Ephigraphia Indica*, Vol. III: pp. 236-258 and *M. E. R.* 1891, p. 9) is plain from the wording; but there may be another meaning found in the expression “Srimat-Tirumalēndrasya Vignāptimanupālayan” which really means, ‘in accordance with the wishes of the prosperous and eminent ruler Tirumala.’ Jesuit evidence says that Tirumala aimed at practical independence by non-payment of tribute.*

* The policy of the Nayaks of Madura generally, since the commencement of the new century at any rate, cannot be regarded as having taken into calculation the actual political condition of the times. The empire was struggling for existence during the first forty years of the century and had barely succeeded in maintaining its existence by being driven successively out from one capital on to another. Penukonda had to be vacated because of the constant harrying of the Muhammadan invasions, Chandragiri had similarly to be abandoned; and early in the reign of Sriranga III, Vellore was being laid siege to. These changes did not happen in a short campaign or two, but by persistent effort during a period of three decades. The absorption of the Chennapattana viceroyalty by Mysore enabled her to make a stand against the aggressions of Bijapur which were now under the guidance of a man of genius, Shahji the Maratha. The whole brunt of the efforts of Golkonda had to be borne by the empire practically single-handed. If Tirumala had only realized this serious situation of the Hindus and had the foresight to perceive the political consequences of the disintegrating movement of which

Bijapur Intervention in the Affairs of the Carnatic

Even early in the reign of Venkatapati Raya his hold on Penukonda was threatened by a vigorously aggressive attitude on the part of Golconda. Raja Udayar of Mysore captured Seringapatam in 1610 and the Raya was then in no position to punish him for this aggressive act. He had to ratify Raja Udayar's possession of Srirangapatnam by a charter and even allowed him to rule over the territories that were hitherto under the viceroy of Srirangapatnam, in A. D. 1612. This

he had made himself the sponsor, if not the author, he would certainly have adopted a policy of co-operation with the empire. The question of Tirumala's loyalty or disloyalty therefore depends upon the question whether, in the political conditions of his time, he could have foreseen the direct results of his action. The action of his predecessors and their attitude towards the empire must necessarily have made it impossible for him to take an impartial view of the situation at the time. The interests of Mysore and the empire ran together a great way. (Dr. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar—Pp. 118-119 of R. Satyanatha Aiyar's 'History of the Nayaks of Madura'.)

Indeed we have no positive evidence to prove that Tirumala prepared for war against his overlord even from the beginning of his rule. "He was careful to make himself strong in defence; even later on he was not disposed to be aggressive." Why he began to organise the defences of his dominions even at the outset of his reign, is not quite clear. His first idea was, probably, to send occasional presents to the Raya, instead of any regular tribute. "But he was not allowed to continue the ambiguous relationship for long."

viceroyalty had comprehended the charges of (1) Srirangapatnam itself, (2) the territories subjected to Chennapatna, which happened to be under a governor, Jaggadeva Rayal, and (3) the so-called Baramahal region of Salem. The viceroy was also in controlling charge of the area ruled by the Nayak of Ikkeri and the frontiers of Srirangapatnam. Raja Udayar could not get effective hold of all these regions. His grandson, Chamaraja Udayar, achieved, by steps, the conquest of the Chennapatna governorship, without the Baramahals; he also made an attempt upon Ikkeri. His successor brought about a Bijapur invasion in order to divert the attention of his enemy, the Nayak of Ikkeri. One of the petty poligars in the neighbourhood of Ikkeri was Kenga Hanuma of Basavapattana; and he, along with a few of his fellow-poligars, was set up against Virabhadra Nayak of Ikkeri. But Virabhadra put down Kenge Hanuma and other rebels and dispossessed the former of his fief. Thereupon Kenge Hanuma went over to the Bijapur court to solicit the aid of its Sultan against the Nayak. Already a similar appeal had been made to Bijapur by another poligar, Channayya of Nagamangala, who had been deprived of his fief by Chamaraja Udayar. Just at this time peace had been established between the Bijapur Sultan

and the Mughals who had been troubling him ; and he readily accepted the invitation to intervene and undertook what may be called the first Mussalman invasion of Mysore.

The invading army was under the command of Ranadulla Khan and it reinstated Kenge Hanuma (A. D. 1638-39). After restoring Kenge Hanuma, the Bijapurians took possession of the three provinces of Ikkeri, Sira and Bangalore, the last of which was under the viceroyalty of the powerful Jagadeva Rayal, but had been lately conquered by Mysore. The Bijapurians next laid siege to Mysore and Srirangapatnam simultaneously ; but they encountered a most unexpected and vigorous resistance ; and the whole campaign ended in a treaty by which the Bijapurians took all the country to the north of the Kaveri, including Bangalore and Sira. Ranadulla Khan left Kenge Hanuma in charge of the territories now acquired by him and returned to Bijapur. Now Virabhadra Nayak of Ikkeri reported against Kenge Hanuma to Bijapur, alleging that the latter was disloyal to the Sultan. Thereupon a commission of inquiry was ordered by the Bijapur government to investigate the matter ; and among the commissioners was Channayya of Nagamangala. Kenge Hanuma, however, behaved in a very treacherous manner towards this

commission, while Kanthīravanarasa of Mysore was not at all anxious to fulfil his obligations to Bijapur under the treaty and continued to give trouble. Ranadulla Khan was thereupon put to disgrace; and two of his successors in command of the invading armies, the latter of them being Mustafa Khan, had to march against Srirangapatnam to punish the Mysore ruler, but were unable to do anything. A fourth invasion by Abdulla Khan and Hemaji Pandit was not able to do much more. Taking advantage of this weakness of Bijapur, Kanthiravanarasa resumed the Chennapatna viceroyalty, entered the Kongu territory and forcibly took possession of Satyamangalam and thus came into hostility with the Nayak of Madura. Kanthīravanarasa was the contemporary of Tirumala Nayak and was frequently engaged in struggles with him, mainly owing to his encroachments into the Kongu territory.

Throughout the reign of Venkatapathi Raya, the administration of the Raya was controlled by the Velugoti brothers of Kalahasti, of whom Damarla Venkatadri (or Venkatappa as he is called in Dutch records) who was the chief of Wandiwash, was the most important. His brother, Aiyappa, resided at Poonamallee to the west of Madras and administered his territory for him, while Venka-

tappa remained at the head-quarters of the Raya and helped him in the general administration of the empire. It was from these two brothers that the English obtained the grant of Fort St. George, which, in the Company's letters, was ascribed to the Great Nayaka Damarla Venkata. When Venkata-pathi Raya died in 1642, Sriranga, his nephew, succeeded; but the Damarla brothers did not desire his succession and in combination with the other governors, created a considerable amount of discontent. Venkata had apparently championed some other claimant; and he was seized and put in confinement by the new monarch; but his kinsmen raised a large army and hoped to restore him to freedom "with the aid of the Muhammadans whom they were hourly expecting," or else "to ruin the whole kingdom." Sriranga was a stronger man than his predecessor and was bent upon consolidating the central authority. Sriranga was not only a pious sovereign, but one endowed with political insight and vigour. He tried alternately to establish a control over the great Nayak chiefs and to use them against the Muslim enemies. "Though his efforts were not crowned with success, justice requires he should be given credit for putting them forth." His authority was recognised during a considerable part of his reign over a

large portion of his kingdom ; certainly he was not a sovereign merely in name.

Sriranga successfully beat off an invasion of Golconda in 1644 ; and there was no interruption in the dating of his records down to 1649 ; though he lost Vellore in 1645. The decade, 1649–59, is barren of inscriptions.

Sriranga ascended the throne towards the end of 1642. Soon after his accession, the rulers of Bijapur and Golconda began an invasion of his territories ; and the Jesuit letters of the times mention the Muhammadan invasions as being the result of Sriranga's dealings with the southern Nayaks. Sriranga had already invaded the dominions of Tirumala Nayak, who had entered into an agreement with his neighbours of Tanjore and Gingee ; and when the Nayak of Tanjore divulged the schemes of his allies to Sriranga, the latter turned on Gingee. Tirumala now sought the help of the Sultan of Golconda, whose invasion Sriranga succeeded in resisting. When the Sultan made active preparations to renew his attack on the Raya, Sriranga entered into negotiations with the southern Nayaks and “spent more than a year with the three Nayaks in the midst of festivities, feasts and pleasures, during which the Muhammadans quietly achieved the conquest of his dominions. Soon, vain joys gave place to jealousies

and divisions. Rejected again by the Nayaks, Sriranga established his court in the forests of Kallans (lying to the north of Tanjore), where he spent four months, a prey to all discomforts; his courtiers soon abandoned him."

Anyhow Sriranga's plans did not unfortunately succeed. He soon lost even his capital, Vellore, wandered about the country, became a refugee at the court of Kanthiravanarasa of Mysore and with the help of the latter recovered a portion of his old territories and defeated the Golconda army which advanced to an attack.

Sivappa Nayak of Ikkeri (1645—60), who possessed an enormous treasure and an army of 40 to 50 thousand men, now came to the help of Sriranga and assisted in the recovery of Vellore from the Muslims. It was possible that Sriranga fled to Sivappa Nayak who had suffered at the hands of Ranadulla Khan and now advanced against the Muhammadans in occupation of Vellore. He commenced a regular blockade of it and soon reduced it to submission. Sriranga was enabled to return to Vellore and honoured Sivappa Nayak with many titles including those of Rāmabhāṇa and Paravārana-Vārana. It is also stated in the *Sivatatva Ratnākara* that Sriranga presented Sivappa with the head of his enemy,

which perhaps meant the general of the Golconda forces in charge of Vellore at the time that it surrendered. Sivappa Nayak is also said to have subdued some of the recalcitrant feudatories of the Empire and handed over their dominions to Sriranga.

Inscriptions dated from 1645-46 to 1649, signifying the continued rule of Sriranga, issued not from the recorded capital of Penukonda, but his personal residence at Vellore. It may therefore be assumed that the restoration of Sriranga to Vellore took place shortly before this period. The Jesuit records say that Sriranga was victorious against Golconda on two occasions and that on the second occasion, he was helped by the Mysore army. It is this second victory that is celebrated in the *Siva Tatva Ratnākara*. It is also about this time that the English at Madras got from Sriranga a confirmation of the charters for their settlement, and their envoys were received by him at Vellore. This was after Sriranga had secured a victory and probably put down the machinations of Damarla Venkatappa. An English letter of the time says that Sriranga's authority was now stronger than ever and that he had brought all his great lords under his command, "which hath not been this forty years before." The Raya's letter to the English inviting them to confide in his word

was dated Arlour (Vellore), 25th September, 1645. His grant to the English, after the visit of their Agent Greenhill to his court, was dated October-November, 1645.

A letter of the Madras Council, of 1645 says that Sriranga had by that time brought his enemies under control and had restored himself to his original position. The Dutch governor of Pulicat, writing about a year before, had said that the Golconda invaders could not attack Pulicat, finding it well equipped. The Nayak of Gingee who was then in rebellion against Sriranga, advanced with the intention of joining the Golconda army, whereupon the Raya recalled the army of Krishnappa Nayak who was operating against the Gingee chief and restored Chinnana, *i.e.*, Mallayya, to favour. Krishnappa fell unexpectedly on the Moors and completely routed them, killing their commander and several other captains. Mallayya was entrusted with the task of putting down the power of the Damarla brothers and of subduing their forts on the coast.

Mallayya (Mallai *alias* Chinana Chetty) had been broker to the Dutch at Pulicat. He was at first hostile to the English at Madras and was “apparently an astute man who not only managed to supersede Venkatadri in the

Pulicat province, but also did good business as the Indian merchant through whom the Dutch made their investments on the coast." Sriranga greatly favoured Mallayya and was helped by him, probably in securing Dutch aid in the matter of completely taking possession of Venkatadris' territories. This was in 1643. The English feared that Mallai who was assisted by the Dutch with guns and men and had been appointed the local governor as well as the 'Treasurer' of the Raya and raised to a position where he 'does in a manner command all' would soon "govern all the seaports even to the very verges of Ceylon." (Letter from Fort St. George to Bantam, 28th January, 1643).

When the Golconda troops laid siege to Pulicat, because the Dutch had joined Sriranga, the English feared that the turn of Madras would follow. Mallayya had tried to mollify the Moors with presents, but could not avert the siege. Fortunately, Sriranga's troops routed the Golconda forces and pursued them up to Udayagiri where they gained a victory (probably the one referred to in the *Rāmarājīyam* and attributed to Sriranga (September 1644).

Mallayya had later to fight the Dutch and besieged Pulicat. The siege lasted several

months, after which the besieging troops had to be withdrawn on account of the Raya having to fight enemies elsewhere (beginning of 1646). Mallayya very cleverly recovered his old position of confidence and influence with the Dutch who were tired of hostilities and received him into favour, though, as the jealous English said, "he was of little use to them" on account of "the great alteration and present poverty of those parts".

Golconda did not take its defeat easily. Mir Jumla, the minister of Golconda, now allied himself with Bijapur and even applied to the Raja of Mysore for assistance; and in the Madras records dated January 1646, we read that Sriranga was definitely attacked by both Bijapur and Golconda. Mir Jumla took possession of Udayagiri, which was the capital of the eastern portion of the kingdom of the Raya, from Mallayya. The surrender of Udayagiri depressed Mallayya who was the governor of that region in succession to Damarla Venkatappa. We learn that the Raya fled, leaving the defence operations to Mallayya who proved treacherous and surrendered "the strongest hold in the kingdom to Mir Jumla, upon composition for himself and all his people to go away free." In October 1647, the Company obtained a renewal of the grant of Madras from Mir Jumla, while the

Raya had fled from the coast region definitely. Mir Jumla now marched upon Gingee, having strengthened himself by an alliance with Bijapur. Before the walls of Gingee, the Bijapur troops joined the Golconda forces and were allowed by the latter to occupy the place. The Bijapur army took possession of Gingee and also Tegnapatam near Cuddalore; and it was now that Sriranga took refuge with the ruler of Mysore, who was then at war with Bijapur.

The Bijapur occupation of Gingee and the coast country near it intensified the prevailing famine and depression of trade. Food became dear, cotton goods were difficult to obtain; Porto Novo and Pondicherry were in a manner ruined, while Tegnapatam was fleeced very much.* Soon afterwards, probably in 1648, Mir Jumla came to be at war with Bijapur. This war between Bijapur and Golconda lasted some years. Bijapur now captured Penukonda and wanted permission to march to Gingee through the territory belonging to Mir Jumla. It was now that Mir Jumla sought the assistance of Mysore and even made overtures of friendship to Sriranga. The Bijapur army advanced up to Vellore, took possession of it and left Sriranga

* See letter from Madras of October 9, 1647.

stranded, with perhaps Chandragiri for his capital and a few miles of territory dependent thereon. This can be regarded as the second flight of Sriranga from his capital.

Let us revert to a survey of events leading to the Mussalman penetration to Gingee, Vellore and the rest of the Carnatic country down to the first capture of Gingee in 1648. In the half a century of confusion that intervened between the battle of Toppur and the death of Shahji in 1664, Mysore did some service to the Hindu Empire by resisting the aggressions of Bijapur, though ultimately the latter power was able to occupy the districts of Chitaldrug, Tumkur and Kolar and also one half of Bangalore. Through all the vicissitudes of the Empire in this epoch, Madura discharged no such duty either to herself or to the Empire. In one sense, indeed, Mysore could claim to have acted as the champion of the Empire, while Madura had not that credit or claim. When Sriranga III ascended the throne of Chandragiri some time about 1642, the Empire was in a very bad condition and could barely maintain an unequal struggle for existence, chiefly through the want of loyalty of the feudatories of the south, particularly of the powerful Tirumala Nayak of Madura. The Raya made, even soon after his accession, an organised effort to bring

these Nayaks under effective allegiance to and co-operation with him. In this move of his, he could let Mysore go on her own path, as she had so far committed herself to no open act of disloyalty, but, on the other hand, by actually occupying the region of the previous Chennapattana viceroyalty, had put herself in the way of the aggressions of Bijapur, thus rendering a positive service to the Empire, though only indirectly.

With regard to the aggressions of Golconda, the Empire had to bear the brunt alone and unaided. Madura which was the only strong feudatory power, did not perceive this root danger to the cause of Hindu independence; and its non-co-operation and frequent treachery might be regarded as constituting one of the primary factors responsible for the gradual extinction of the Hindu Empire. This evil was largely due to the attitude of Tirumala Nayak. Mysore openly threw off its nominal allegiance to Vijayanagar only in 1646, when it was threatened seriously by Golconda.

It was now that Shahji, the Maratha general of Bijapur, showed himself in his most important aspect as the ultimate saviour of the Hindu cause. Along with Ranadulla Khan, he had attacked the Nayak of Ikkeri

and occupied his capital as well as one half of his kingdom (1637—38). Two years later, he once again helped in the defeat of the Nayak, but also contributed to his subsequent restoration to his principality. It was about this time also that the Nayak of Sira was defeated and killed treacherously by Afzal Khan, one of the Bijapur generals, in the course of an attempted negotiation. Sira was handed over to Kenga Hanuma of Basavapatnam, the sworn enemy of the Nayak of Ikkeri; while Kempe Gowda, the chief of Bangalore, was likewise threatened into submission and forced to retire to Savandurga. Shahji had been promised a jagir in these new conquests of Bijapur and was actually given charge of Bangalore in 1638. He subdued the Udayar ruler of Seringapatnam, Kanthīrava Narasaraaja, but arranged to leave him undisturbed in possession of his territory and fort. He is also credited, according to the *Shiva Bhārat*, with winning over the Nayaks of Madura and Kaveripatam to his side. He distinguished himself again by an attack on Kenge Hanuma of Basavapatnam. A most noteworthy achievement of Shahji at this point of his career was his attempt at the formation of a confederacy of the local Nayaks and of several Maratha and Muslim chiefs in support of the Bijapur invaders against the powerful Nayaks of Ikkeri,

particularly Sivappa, who had indeed restored and vastly increased the strength of that state and who showed himself a warm supporter of the cause of the Hindu Empire. In 1644 and in subsequent years, Shahji contrived to earn further honours for himself and to organize a combination of the Nayaks of Gingee, Madura and Tanjore against the opposition of the Raya and against Jagadeva of Kaveripatnam. When Vellore was invested by the Bijapur forces, Shahji commanded the right wing of the army and was given the charge of the place along with a Muhammadan colleague, as well as the high titles of Maharaja and Farzand. Shahji contrived to become, by 1648, the effective governor of all the Bijapur conquests from the Ghats (hence called Karnatak Bijapur Balaghat). He ruled over all these territories from Bangalore, but sometimes also from Kolar and Dodballapur.

When the great campaign of 1648 was being waged by Bijapur against Gingee, consequent on its investment by Mir Jumla, the famous general of Golconda, Shahji found that the Bijapur troops, instead of helping Tirumala Nayak of Madura who had repented of his short-sighted policy and sought an alliance with them for the defence of the Gingee Nayak, was actually in league with the foe. He saw that his Muslim

colleague had come to a secret understanding with the enemy and therefore contrived to prolong the operations. After the Bijapurians had acquired Gingee towards the end of 1648, Shahji became even more powerful than before. Even during the course of the operations against the place, Nawab Mustafa Khan, the Bijapur *generalissimo*, had begun to fear that Shahji was helping the enemies and was even then secretly planning a powerful combination of the Hindu rulers of the country consisting of the Nayaks of Madura, Tanjore and Gingee and the chiefs of Mysore, Kaveripatnam and Ikkeri, the coalition to be headed by the Emperor Sriranga and Shahji himself. There followed shortly afterwards Shahji's imprisonment at Bijapur at the instance of his redoubtable enemy, Mustafa Khan. His release from prison must have been due in some measure to the opportune death of his enemy, Mustafa Khan, and partly to the threatening attitude of the Mughals who now began a series of attacks on the northern frontier of Bijapur.

In the course of the expeditions of the Khan-i-Khanan (Muzaffar-ud-din) in 1644-45 and of Nawab Mustafa Khan in the years 1646-48, Shahji had contrived to gain further honours for himself. The campaign of 1644 had been the outcome of an alliance between Bijapur and Sriranga Raya of Vellore who

was opposed by a powerful combination of the Golconda Sultan and his own ministers and Nayak feudatories. In the latter campaign led by the Bijapur general, Mustafa Khan, he organised a combination of the Nayaks of Gingee, Madura and Tanjore and also those of Harpanahalli and Ikkeri against the determined opposition of Sriranga Raya. He fought in January 1646 against Jagadeva, the Raja of Kaveripatnam, and forced him to take refuge in Krishnadrug and also compelled the Raya to take to flight. Subsequently, the Bijapur army annexed a large part of the Baramahals and proceeded against Vellore, under the walls of which a terrible battle was fought, in which the slaughter on the Hindu side was very great. In this Shahji commanded the right wing of the victorious army. Then followed an investment of the fort of Vellore and the submission of the Raya who paid a large indemnity in gold and gave 150 elephants. Shahji and a Muhammadan colleague were left in charge of the government of the conquered territories. The Golconda forces also joined in this campaign.

The campaign against Vellore was the outcome of events by which Golconda had contrived to annex a good part of the Carnatic on the eastern side, from Masulipatam on the coast down to the neighbourhood of Madras.

The contracted power of the Raya of Vellore was thus hemmed in on both sides by its two old enemies, Bijapur and Golconda. Udayagiri was captured by the Golconda forces in 1646. The internal dissensions that now beset the disintegrating kingdom of the Raya were worsened by the infectious treachery of the brothers, Damarla Venkatadri and Ayyappa, who called in the aid of Golconda; and this treachery was copied by Tirumala Nayak of Madura, who seduced the Nayaks of Tanjore and Gingee over to his side. Though the Nayak of Tanjore went back to his loyalty, Tirumala Nayak ultimately brought about the break-up of the Vijayanagar Empire by his continued treachery. By 1645, Mir Jumla, the general of the Golconda forces, had successfully penetrated the country as far as Vellore, advancing by way of Ongole, Nellore and Chittoor. At the same time, the Bijapur forces also converged on Vellore. The combined forces first laid seige to Vellore about the beginning of 1645 A. D. Sriranga Raya had to flee for his life, leaving the defence to one Mallayya who proved treacherous and surrendered to the forces of Mir Jumla, upon composition for himself and all his people. Sriranga then sought the help of Sivappa Nayak of Ikkeri; and the latter took advantage of the opportunity to advance against

Vellore and to reduce it to submission. The restoration of Sriranga by Sivappa Nayak was a great service to the Hindu cause. It led to Sriranga granting him the titles of Ramabhāṇa and Paravārana Vārana, (Taranga xiv, Kallola vii, of Keladi Basava's *Siva Tattva Ratnakara*). We have a number of inscriptions testifying to the continuous and effective rule of Sriranga from 1645–1646 to 1649; and this would lead to the inference that Sriranga was then in undisputed occupation of the interior country, at least round Vellore.

In 1648, there was waged the great campaign against Gingee which had been invested by Mir Jumla. This campaign was now induced by Tirumala Nayak of Madura who repented of his short-sighted policy and sought an alliance with the Bijapur ruler and with the help of the latter, marched to relieve Gingee from the forces of Mir Jumla. But the Muslims soon came to an understanding among themselves; and Tirumala Nayak could not effectively help the defence of Gingee. In the course of the operations, Shahji, as noted above, being dissatisfied with the conduct of Mustafa Khan, the commander-in-chief, contrived to prolong the operations; while Mir Jumla took advantage of the dissensions among the generals of the Bijapur army and even formed a secret alliance with the Raya.

The Nayak of Gingee was at last forced to surrender to the Bijapur army towards the end of December 1649.* The city of Gingee was given over to plunder and the victors got several crores worth of cash and jewels. In this campaign, the Pindari free-booters who always hung in the rear of the army, were allowed to spread desolation and devastation through the land, particularly round the ports of Devanampatam, Porto Novo and Puduchēri (afterwards to become the French settlement).

After this Bijapurian acquisition of Gingee, Shahji became easily even more powerful than before. The rebellious conduct of his son, Shivaji, against the Adil Shah, led to secret orders from Bijapur for the arrest of Shahji. According to the *Muhammad Namah*, some incidents occurred during the siege of Gingee, that led to a misunderstanding between him and Nawab Mustafa Khan. Sir J. N. Sarkar holds that the arrest of Shahji was due to his disloyal intrigues with the Raya of Vellore and with the Sultan of Golconda. Shahji had now become the virtual ruler of the Carnatic; and probably, he thought that he might throw off the yoke of Bijapur and become openly independent. Perhaps, Shahji

* 17th December, 1649—Sarkar. *History of Aurangzib*, Vol. I, p. 254.

did not like the idea of Nawab Mustafa Khan making common cause with Mr. Jumla. Perhaps, also, Mustafa Khan might, by having Shahji arrested, have planned to forestall a powerful combination of the Hindu rulers of the country consisting of the Nayaks of Madura, Gingee and Tanjore and of the chiefs of Mysore, Kaveripatnam and Ikkeri, headed by Sriranga and Shahji himself.

Shahji returned to his charge and in 1651 got a definite victory over Mir Jumla, who had made himself the effective master of a rich tract of country on the Madras coast and also concluded a peace with Sriranga. This defeat of Mir Jumla greatly enhanced the reputation of Shahji and gave a new vigour to the campaigns of the Bijapurians, who contrived to capture the important fortress of Penukonda. This loss of Penukonda greatly alarmed the Hindu ruler; and Sriranga at first appealed for help to Prince Aurangzib, then the Mughal viceroy of the Deccan; he even contrived to re-conquer with the help of the Mysore ruler, a part of his territory and to regain Vellore for a time. Vellore was quickly recaptured by the Bijapur forces and the Raya was forced to conclude a treaty by which, he had to be content with the possession of Chandragiri and the revenues of certain adjoining districts. Even from these, the

Raya was ultimately driven out by the treachery of the Nayak of Madura and had to finally seek shelter with Sivappa Nayak.

In September 1654 the English factors at Madras reported that the Sultan of Golconda suspected Mir Jumla of a plan to make himself the independent sovereign of the districts he had brought under his control in South India, with the help of Bijapur. Aurangzib, the Mughal viceroy of the Deccan, who was eagerly waiting for an opportunity to interfere in the affairs of the Deccan Sultans, caught Mir Jumla in his own net of persuasive intrigue and the latter agreed to enter the service of the Mughal Emperor. This news so alarmed the Sultan of Golconda that he sought to win back the friendship of his old minister ; and Mir Jumla consequently wavered in his attitude and delayed joining the service of the Mughals till the latter part of 1655, when the Sultan imprisoned his family at Golconda, having been provoked into action by the haughty behaviour of his son. So Mir Jumla precipitated his breach with his master and betook himself to the camp of Aurangzib openly. Mir Jumla got a confirmation of his possessions in the Carnatic from Shah Jahan and continued his advance in that region up to July 1656. In November 1656 Sriranga had recovered some districts and laid seige to

Pulicat as against Mir Jumla, very likely with the support of the king of Golconda, who was angry that the Mughal Emperor should have decided to treat as his dominion whatever Mir Jumla had conquered in the Carnatic and had ordered the Sultan to recall his officers from these territories. Sriranga took advantage of this attitude of Golconda and called upon his father-in-law to seize the territory of Peddapālayam (Periyapālayam) near Madras and the neighbourhood of Pulicat and see the country rendered obedient to him.*

According to the Dutch records of January 1657, Koneri Chetti who was entrusted with the operations on behalf of Sriranga Raya, betrayed his master and made overtures

* “And all the country hereabouts (Punnamalee castle excepted) rendered to the Jentu King's obedience, who now, in the Nabob's absence, is up in armes for the recovering of his kingdome, and hath already recovered a large part.”

‘Next, from a letter sent by the Madras factors to Bantam, dated November 5, we learn that—

“All these countries that were formerly conquered by the Nabob are now of late (in his absence at the Moghulls court) upon the revolt, the Jentue King with diverse Nagues being in arms; some of whose forces are now at the seige of Paleacatt, where tis said most of the Nabobs riches are stowed. Here is nothing but takeing and retakeing of places, with parties of both sides, in all places; soe that tis very dangerous giving out monies for goods in these tymes. But wee hope ere long it will be settled especially for us if the King recovers his cuntry.”

to Tubaki Krishnappa of Gingee, who had become Mir Jumla's lieutenant; and the latter, *i.e.*, Tubaki Krishnappa, is said to have inflicted a defeat upon Sriranga in September 1657. The letters of Greenhill and Chamber, from Madras in January 1657, mentioned the treachery of Koneri Chetti, who was the general of the Raya in the districts round Poonamalle and charged him with having neglected the subjugation of Poonamallee castle and delayed till the enemy overpowered him. Koneri Chetti gave himself up to the Muhammadans as a prisoner, "but was received in state by the commanders with more than accustomed honour in such cases; which, considered with his alliance and near relation to Topa Kistnappa, the Nabob's general, together with other circumstances and observations in his present deport and continued respect from ditto Kistnappa, are sufficient to ground the general suspicion of his betraying the king's army." (Report made to the Company by Greenhill and Chamber on January 28, 1657).

A letter from Batavia, written towards the end of January 1657, mentions that Sriranga had by that time captured the pagoda of Tirupati and designed the conquest of the districts of Conjeevaram, Chingleput and Pulicat and now requested the Dutch at the last

place either to help him by getting for him the Nawab's treasures secured there for safety or at least to remain neutral in the event of his making an attack on that place. Mir Jumla had by this time betaken himself to the Mughal court at Agra. His general, Tubaki Krishnappa, who was an experienced soldier, gained an advantage over the Raya's army in an engagement from which they fled precipitately and ignominiously in the direction of Arni, "a strong castle on the borders of Ginge" (Gingee). From Arni they were trying to get the alliance of the Bijapurians in order to take the field with greater force than before. In the meantime, Tubaki Krishnappa was reported to have strengthened himself by all possible means in order to see whether he could not gain an advantage over the Raya before he should seek help from the Bijapurians. Taking advantage of the absence of Mir Jumla, the Golconda forces began to attack Tubaki Krishnappa in the neighbourhood of Poonamalle. In August 1658, there was fighting between Tubaki Krishnappa and the Golconda troops round Poonamalle. Tubaki Krishnappa came to terms with the Governor of Fort St. George with whom he had been on inimical terms, in order that he might be free for this struggle with Golconda. We learn from the Madras factors that

Krishnappa besieged the castle of Poonamalle which had revolted to the king of Golconda. In October 1658, Kuli Beg, the commandant of the Golconda forces, inflicted a serious defeat on Tubaki Krishnappa, who was wounded and taken prisoner. The victor subdued all the districts round Madras ; the settlement of San Thomē submitted to him ; and the Dutch at Pulicat came to terms with him. In the next year, 1659, there was further fighting. Bijapur had definitely gone over to the side of the Raya ; and Rustam-i-Zaman Bahlol Khan and Shahji, who were regarded as great friends at the Bijapur court, were expected to march across the Carnatic to Gingee with a large number of troops and overthrow the government of Krishnappa. Shahji was to proceed from his government in the Mysore country to Gingee. We now come to the final sacking of Gingee and the fall of Tubaki Krishnappa, 1659 was therefore a very eventful year, in which Bijapur got into a definite occupation of Gingee. It was also marked by the last death-throes of the revivalist ambitions of Sriranga at the recovery of his dominions and by the death of Kanthīravanarasa of Mysore and of Tirumala Nayak of Madura.

Flushed with the conquest of Gingee, the Muslims advanced upon Tanjore and wrought there incalculable havoc. The Nayak hid

himself in the forests and allowed the enemy to plunder and devastate the country. Thus, after conquering a vast country and subduing two powerful rulers and gathering incalculable treasures, the Muslim army returned triumphantly to Bijapur. The emperor Sriranga III continued his efforts to recover his lost territories; and Father Proenza has observed in his letter of 1659 thus:—"Encouraged by the good reception and help of the King of Mysore, he took advantage of the absence of the Bijapuri general in the Deccan and advanced with an army of Mysoreans to expel the army of Golconda." He concluded then, that if the three Nayaks had joined the Emperor with all the troops they could gather, success would have attended their efforts. There was, unfortunately, no union amongst the Nayaks; and especially Tirumala Nayaka did not co-operate with him, but assumed the role of a hostile power. Sriranga III having failed in his attempts, had to take refuge in Mysore where he led a miserable life.*

* The one consequence of the fall of the Vijayanagara empire was the expansion of the Muhammadans further south. Golconda retained mastery over the Carnatic plains down to the banks of the South Pennar comprising Guntur, Nellore, North Arcot and Chingleput districts, while Bijapur was allowed to hold the rest of the Carnatic. Prof. Rangacharya remarks:—"What Malik Kafur failed to do, and what the Bahmani Sultans and their successors failed to do for centuries was now

done by the treachery of Tirumala Nayak." Mr. R. Satyanatha Iyer in his 'Nayaks of Madura' takes the other side of the question and says that Sriranga did not seem to have considered the practicability of revitalising the Empire in the teeth of provincial opposition. "What was witnessed at Rakhastagdi (Talikota) in 1565 was repeated at Gingee in 1649. The Muhammadan powers perceived their strength and were determined to use it for themselves. They found a way in the disunity of the Nayaks and utilised it to their own advantage. Ever since the battle of 1565, the feudatories of the Empire were caring more for their separate interests than for the imperial ones. Moreover, the civil war of 1614—17 had damaged the prestige of the Empire and accentuated the provincial interests."

APPENDICES

Account of the operations of the capture of Gingee in 1648 as recorded in the Muhammed-Namah and the Basātin-al-Salātin.

Finding Gingee impregnable, Mir Jumla succeeded in securing the assistance of the Bijapur army. Thereupon, Tirumala Nayak of Madura deserted by his Muslim friends began to actively help the besieged. He also succeeded in fanning the flames of enmity between Golconda and Bijapur, and the effect of his diplomacy was the raising of the siege by Mir Jumla. The latter retired to make new acquisitions in the present Cud-dapah district and to consolidate his previous conquests. Thus the Bijapuri army was left alone to conduct the siege. There was further trouble ahead. The principal commanders like Shahji, Khairiyat Khan and Siddi Raihan were dissatisfied with Mustafa Khan; and their insubordination and non-co-operation naturally prolonged the operations. Some-time after, Mustafa himself succumbed to old age and died in harness there on 9th November, 1648. The command passed on first to Malik Raihan, and then to Muzaffar-ud-din, Khan-i Khanan Khan and Muhammad. With the heroic assistance of Afzal Khan, the fort

is said to have been ultimately reduced in December 1648.

According to the Basatin-i-Salatin, Rup Nayak, "the Raja of Gingee, was very proud and wealthy. His family had been in possession of the fort for seven hundred years. Being given to a licentious and luxurious life, he had neglected the affairs of his kingdom. As he was not helped by the neighbouring chiefs during the siege and because his provisions and fodder were exhausted, he was ultimately forced to surrender the fort to the Bijapurians on 28th December 1648. Besides the vast quantities of wealth plundered by the soldiers for themselves, the Bijapuri army got hold of all the accumulated riches of the Gingee rulers. It amounted to four crores of huns and 20 crores of rupees in cash and jewels."

"The country which had nothing except idol worship and infidelity for thousands of centuries was illuminated with the light of Islam through the endeavours and good wishes of the king. The treasures, gems, jewels and other property worth four crores of huns were added to the imperial treasury. Mosques were erected in the cities which were full of temples and the preachers and criers were appointed in order to propagate the Muhammadan religion."

All the Muslim army was not employed in reducing the fort of Gingee. It appears from the English Records that in this campaign the Bijapur rulers employed the well-known Pindaris for the wanton desolation and devastation of the land. This fact is worth noticing, since afterwards Shivaji followed in the foot-steps of the Muslim rulers in some of his activities. His system of plunder was surely more humane than the one that was used by the Bijapuri war-lords in the Carnatic.

“ Nations who lye within two daies journey one of another with powerful armies, watching all advantage upon each other, yet both strive to make a prey of this miserable and distracted or divided people. These are the Gulcandah and the Vizapoore (Bijapur) Moores, the latter of which hath brought in 8,000 freebooters who receive noe pay but plunder what they can; whose incursions, robberies, and devastacions hath brought desolation on a great part of the country round about, specially the three prime cloth ports, Tevenampatam, Porto Novo, and Pullacherey (Pondicherry) of which the two last are in a manner ruin'd, the other hardly preserveing itselfe in a poore condition with continueall presents.”

Flushed with the conquest of Gingee, the Muslim lords advanced into the territories of Madura and Tanjore. Both the weak-minded Nayaks shut themselves up in inaccessible forests and allowed the enemy to plunder and devastate the country in the manner described above. Finally, they opened negotiations and submitted to the Muslims. Thus, after threatening two powerful Nayaks, gathering incalculable treasures, and without losing many men, the army returned to Bijapur.

Gingee should have finally fallen in 1658, shortly before Tirumala Nayak's death. Orme has placed the conquest of Gingee by Bijapur about 1655 A. D. The date, 1658 A. D., can be accepted, as we have got the corroborating evidence of the letter of Father Proenza, dated 1659 A. D., which deals with the capture of the place by the Bijapur forces.

Gingee suffered much from the cruelties of the Muhammadans as is evidenced by the Jesuit letter dated 1666 (from Andrew Friere to Paul Oliva). "Nothing can equal the cruelties which the Muhammadans employ in the Government of Gingee. Expression fails me to recount the atrocities which I have seen with my own eyes." Another letter of 1662 from Proenza to Oliva says that, "the

people were not very uneasy thereby. They sufficiently accommodated themselves to the yoke of the conqueror."

II.—Attempts at the Restoration of the Nayak Dynasty of Gingee, 1660.

An energetic prince, Chokkanātha Nayak of Madura, the successor of Tirumala Nayak, reversed the policy of his predecessor and made preparations to carry out the ambitious scheme of an offensive war against the Muhammadans and to restore the old political order of things. Chokkanātha was aided in this by his *Pradhāni*, the *Rāyasam* and the *Dalavāy*. The Dalavay, Lingama Nayaka, was sent with an army of 40,000 men to drive Shahji (Sagosi of the Jesuit letter—who was one of the commanders of the Bijapuri forces employed in the conquest of Gingee) from Gingee and take possession of it. Lingama procrastinated with the plan and enriched himself with bribes from the Muhammadan generals. The ministers at Madura hatched a plot, in the meanwhile, to dethrone Chokkanātha Nayak and put his younger brother in his place. Chokkanātha heard about it and punished them with death. Lingama who was also a member of the plot, joined Shahji and persuaded him to besiege Trichinopoly. Chokkanātha was successful in driving them ;

and Lingama and Shahji had to flee to Tanjore and thence to Gingee. Thus this earnest attempt of Chokkanātha to restore the old order of things and, especially, to restore the Nayak line of Gingee was frustrated by intrigues at his own court. His failure has been recorded in the Jesuit letter of Proenza to Oliva, dated Trichinopoly, 1662.

Bijapur was in possession of the fortress of Gingee till 1677 when the famous Sivaji, the son of Shahji, fell upon it in his momentous Carnatic expedition.

The inscriptions (860–861 of 1918) which are dated 1671 A. D. and found at Tirupparankunram, refer to Varadappa Nayak and his gifts to the temple there on his return from a pilgrimage to Sethu Rameswaram. Probably this Nayak had the nominal title, being the last descendant of the old Nayak line of Gingee. Orme has referred to the fact that the title Nayak was used long after the establishment of the Muhammadans by certain representatives of the old line of rulers.

III.—Social and General Conditions under the Nayak Rulers of Gingee.

REVENUE:—The gradual expansion of the Vijayanagara empire made it so unwieldy for one monarch to have control over all its parts,

that it had to be divided into provinces that were entrusted to the Nayaks and other feudal chiefs. Such provinces were those of Madura, Tanjore and Gingee. "The letter of Proenza to Nickel, dated Trichinopoly, 1652, refers to the three Nayaks being the feudatories of Narasinga of Vijayanagar." Another traveller, John Nieuhoff, had also referred in his "Travels and Voyages in the East Indies", to the three great Nayaks. These Nayaks were very powerful, and they paid a tribute of six to ten million francs to the government of Vijayanagar. The revenue administration of the empire was so excellent and systematic that the sources of revenue were finally fixed and reduced to a regular form. Whenever the central government showed any signs of weakness, the feudatories became unpunctual in their payment and even sometimes openly refused to acknowledge their obligations. The total revenue of the Vijayanagara empire has been considered to be very great and unparalleled in South India. Foreign travellers like Paes and Nuniz have given accounts of revenue of the feudatories of the Empire. Moreover, the splendour of Vijayanagara excited their astonishment. Varthema wrote in 1502:—"The king of Narasinga is the richest monarch. His Brahman priests say that he has a revenue of 12,000 parados a day."

According to tradition, Krishnadeva Raya derived three crores of rupees from the districts of Karnataka.

Thus we find that the empire was rich and powerful. No wonder each Nayak was powerful and was remitting to the central treasury annually six to ten million francs which amounted to £ 24,000 to £ 40,000. The tribute was one-third of the total revenue; and hence the income of each Nayak should have been about £ 120,000 annually. If the country was not prosperous, such an amount of revenue could have hardly been realised by the central power. The letter of the Jesuit, Vico dated (Madura) the 30th August 1611, refers to the fact that, on the refusal of the Nayak to pay tribute, the Vijayanagara monarch sent one of his generals with 100,000 men to demand it by force. On such occasions the poor paid heavily for the default of the rulers. The country was devastated and the people plundered and massacred. This view of the Jesuit seems to be exaggerated. The Nayaks of Gingee were paying an equal amount of tribute with those of Madura and Tanjore.

In the material relating to the Bijapur conquest of Gingee in 1658, the Nayak of Gingee was described in the different records as the richest and the proudest of monarchs.

The *Basātīn-al-Salātīn* * gives us an idea of the total acquired by the Muhammadans. It says :—“The total wealth amounted to four crores of huns or 20 crores of rupees in cash and jewels. Another Jesuit letter (1659, Proenza to Nickel) stated that the booty acquired by the Muhammadans was immense, consisting of silver, gold and pearls and precious stones of inestimable value.

The condition of the people.

The Hindus have ever been noted for their hospitality to foreign travellers and envoys. Travellers of the Vijayanagara period like Abdur Razaak and Nikitin have given details of how they were hospitably treated. They were assigned lofty mansions for lodging and feasted very well. The Jesuit travellers of the reign of Venkata I were also hospitably treated wherever they went; and the Nayak viceroys and other feudatories imitated their masters in this as in other matters.

Father Pimenta who visited the court of Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee in 1599 A. D.

* This is a Persian history of the Ādil Shāhs down to Aurangzib's conquest, with a brief summary of subsequent events, and contains eight sections called *basātīn*. An Urdu translation, in Nāgarī character, was published of the work at Baroda. The author completed the work in 1822, and intended it for presentation to J. C. Grant-Duff.

has told us how he was received at the court. "The Nayak of Gingee was come hither in whose dominions it standeth. He commanded that we should be brought to his presence. He appointed our lodging in the tower though the heat forced us to the grove nearby. Whatever was rare and precious in the fort was shown to the Fathers. He entertained us kingly and marvelled much that we chewed not the leaves of betel which were offered to us and dismissed us with gifts of precious cloths wrought with gold and desiring a priest of us for his new city which he was building." Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee allowed Father Pimenta to build a church in Krishnapatam, *i.e.*, Porto Novo, which he had built and even gave a large endowment of 200 pieces of gold for the purpose. This grant was made in the presence of all the nobles of the court.

At the end of 1608 an embassy from the Dutch traders arrived at Krishnappa Nayaka's court at Gingee requesting permission to establish themselves at Dēvanāmpatnam Fort near Cuddalore. According to the Jesuit letter of 1609 the Nayak received the Dutch very hospitably and allowed them to build a citadel at the place of landing.

The letters of Fr. Pimenta throw light on some of the peculiar customs and ceremonies

of the Nayak court of Gingee, like the purificatory rites:—The customs and manners of the Hindus seemed peculiar and fantastic to the foreigners; and the strange and curious observations of Fr. Pimenta are largely due to his ignorance of the ancient customs of the land. His description of Krishnappa Nayaka reveals the orthodox surroundings of the ruler. “The Nayak showed us his golden staff amongst which were two great pots carried on men’s shoulders full of water for the king to drink.” Men who returned from the north generally brought in such vessels Ganges water for the use of the king. It was always considered so sacred that it was used for purificatory purposes.

The anxiety of the people to perform purificatory ceremonies on their pollution caused by their association with foreigners, is illustrated in a number of epigraphs.

According to Father Pimenta, tilting, (*i.e.*, a kind of martial exercise) was practised in the court of Gingee in 1597 A. D. Great importance was attached to games and amusements in the festival seasons in the Vijayanagara days. These games were an index of the martial character of the people. The Vijayanagara people were more attracted by fencing, duelling, wrestling and hunting than

by sedentary amusements. Fencing and duelling seem to have been held in high repute in the land. Castenheda, in his "History of Portugal", writes thus of Vijayanagar: "There were many duels on account of love of women wherein many men lost their lives." Barbosa, another traveller, has also referred to the wide prevalence of such duelling. According to Nuniz, great honour was done to those who fought in a duel. Paes, writing about 1520, has informed us that women too were engaged in wrestling which was another of their pastimes. During festivals women were said to have wrestled in a large arena in the presence of the nobles and the king. Thus foreign travellers have given accounts of the various games and amusements practised at Vijayanagara; and these were given sufficient encouragement by the monarchs themselves. The provincial viceroys followed their master; and hence, in the court of Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee, tilting with swords was practised.

The splendour and magnificence of the court of Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee is best visualised from the account of Fr. Pimenta. He writes of the Nayak thus: "We found him lying on a silken carpet leaning on two cushions, with a long silken garment, a great chain hanging from the neck, distinguished with

many pearls and gems all over his breast, his long hair tied with a knot on the crown adorned with pearls. Some princes and Brahmans attended him. He was guarded homeward with a thousand armed men. The streets were ranked with three hundred elephants as if fitted for war. At the porch or the entrance of the palace one entertained the Nayak with an oration in his praise, a thing usual in their solemn pomp." Krishnappa Nayaka then showed him and his companions his store of jewels and gave them leave in his new city which he was then building. Fr. Du Jarrie has described the gaudy dress of the orator in red robes. Thus we are enabled to get a picture of the pomp of the Nayak of Gingee.

The Palace of the Nayak at Gingee.

According to Father Pimenta, the residences of the Nayak were noble and prominent, being built in a peculiar style and equipped with towers and verandahs. The Nayak had two such palaces, one inside the fort and the other in the city or the *pettah* of Gingee. The gates of the palaces were carefully guarded and when anybody entered them with permission, there followed the firing of the guns, the parade of the soldiers and the soundings of the buglers. Paes has given a vivid description of the royal palace of Vijayanagara.

Regarding the residences of the nobles, there are but meagre notices available from our travellers. The private dwellings were plain and not elaborate, except those belonging to the rich and influential people. Father Heras has referred to the spacious houses found in Gingee; very probably they belonged to the nobles.

Barbosa has written in one of his passages thus: "In the city as well there are palaces after the royal fashion with many enclosed courts and great houses very well built and with wide open spaces with water-tanks full of fish in great numbers wherein dwell the great lords and governors." Paes has written that the houses of the army captains and other rich and honourable men were adorned with many figures and decorations that were pleasing to look at.

The habitations of the ordinary people were modest in appearance. Generally a house had a garden around it; and it was usually built of bricks and tiles. According to the Karnataka inscription of 1372 (*E. C. IV-Gu. 34*) the houses in the Karnataka and the Tamil countries were built according to standard rules. Barbosa informs us that the houses of the poorer classes were generally covered with thatch, but, none the less, well built; and

they were arranged, according to the respective occupations of the owners, in long streets with many open spaces.

An inscription of the year 1632 of the reign of Sriranga (65 of 1922) registers an undertaking by the residents of the village of Tiruvāmāttur in the South Arcot District, that the three artisan communities (*Kammāḷa*) carpenters, blacksmiths and goldsmiths of the several villages in the northern ward should no longer be ill-treated or deprived of their privileges, and that the same rights and privileges as were being enjoyed by their brethren in Padaivīdu, Senji, Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and Kānchīpuram should be accorded to them and that in case of default a fine of 12 *pon* was to be paid by the residents. The record has mentioned by name Krishnappa Nayaka, probably the well-known Nayak of Gingee of the time.

The above record throws light on the occasional interference in social affairs that was indulged in by the state. Such interferences generally concerned the mutual relations and respective rights of the minor communities of weavers and artisans and often took place at the request of the people themselves. The government carefully inquired into the disputes and settled details which

were mostly about trivial formalities that however caused much concern in the locality. The state had settled similar questions under the Cholas.

In the Vijayanagara period we have numerous instances illustrating state interference in social matters. An inscription of Saka 1407 A. D. (1485–1486, 473 of 1921) refers to the privileges granted to the Kaikkōlars of using *tandu* (palanquin) and conch as their insignia carried in processions on festive and other occasions on the model of those of Kānchīpuram who were enjoying those privileges. Another inscription of A. D. 1546 (41 of 1922) refers to Sūrappa Nayak, the governor over the Tiruvati Rajyam who enacted similar measures in connection with Ilaivāṇiyars who were accorded the same privileges as the Kaikkōlars of the place. The inscription of 1632 A. D. already referred to (65 of 1922) is one of such instance of the interference of the state. These indicate the care bestowed by the government in maintaining the needed equilibrium of the privileges among the different communities, particularly of the trading and industrial sections of the population.

The continued vitality of the Hindu Empire required a proper encouragement of the commercial and agricultural castes who were

very keen that their hereditary rights and privileges should be unimpaired and thus be helped to maintain the social harmony and the material prosperity of the land. The barber, the Kaikkōlar and the Kammālar castes had been prominent in the Vijayanagara country and deemed to have been greatly serviceable to the state. The privileges demanded by these communities on the basis of precedents were therefore readily conceded, if they did not result in collision. Relative harmony was thus established among the various communities.

The offering of the betel-leaf and areca-nuts to guests has been an ancient practice of the Hindus and other immigrant communities. The offering of the betel-leaf and nuts is the first as well as the last courtesy that one is expected to show to a guest. The author of the *Sukra-Niti* has mentioned the presentation of the betel-leaf and nuts. This peculiar system ought to have originated in Southern India and was said to have been practised by the Yadavas of Devagiri. It was one of the acknowledged modes of conferring honour and recognition on warriors and statesmen. The offer of the betel-leaf in royal assemblages and military reviews had a political significance besides and played a conspicuous part in the social life of the people. Foreign

travellers that visited the Vijayanagara country have told us of the presentation of the betel-leaf by the king to the generals on formal occasions. They have also indicated the importance of the betel-leaf in the every day life of the people. An inscription at Enṇāyiram in the South Arcot District (332 of 1917) of Sadasivadeva Maharaya, dated *Saka* 1467, refers to the provision made for presenting the betel-leaf offering in the temple of Alagiya Singaperumal Swami. When Father Pimenta and his companions visited the court of Krishnappa Nayaka at Gingee in 1599 A. D., the latter is said to have “ marvelled much that we chewed not the leaves of betel which he offered us.” This shows that the offering of betel-leaf, as an invariable sign of courtesy and respect, was in vogue even in the case of the reception of foreigners.*

* The betel-leaf was a hoary indigene of India and the Indo-China regions. The word is derived from Malayalam *vettīla* (i.e., *veru* + *ila* = simple leaf), through the Portuguese corruption thereof, *betre* and *betle*. For long the sale of betel-leaf was a monopoly of the Company in its early settlements. Marco Polo, Abdur Razzak, Vasco da Gama, Varthema, Barbosa and all the earlier European travellers have remarked on the use of the betel; and Sri Thomas Roe has also noticed the distribution of betel-leaf and areca-nut as well as cocoanuts among the folk assembled at any important function. The betel-leaf bearer (*tāmbūla-karandavāhin*) has been from the earliest times an important household functionary in the royal court. The first Nayak of Tanjore was the betel-leaf page to his royal master.

We have already seen that the Nayak rule in the Gingee country enabled the strengthening and further fortification of the capital and the construction of forts in many strategical places. The temples and *mantapams* in the capital were largely the handiwork of the Nayaks. The Venkataramaṇa-swāmi temple at the foot of the Rajagiri hill has already been referred to as having been built by one Muthialu Nayakan, about whom we have no authentic information, though his name is mentioned in the dynastic lists furnished by the Mackenzie manuscripts.

The Kalyāṇa Mantapam, a most peculiar structure in the fortress of Rajagiri, must have also been built by the Nayaks, for it is marked by the *mantapam* style of construction, so characteristic of the Vijayanagara period.* According to Mackenzie Mss.** one Krishnappa (probably the first Krishnappa) is said to have built the Kalyāṇa Mahāl. “His long and peaceful administration resulted in the

* A record of the year 1924 (426 of 1924) of Sevvappa Nayaka of Tanjore engraved on the Pushya Mantapa of Tiruvadi near Tanjore refers to the steps of the ghat in the river, called the Kalyāṇa Sindhu, being built by him. The adjoining buildings of the bathing ghat go also by the name of Kalyāṇa Mahāl. Hence we find the prefix Kalyāṇa attached to prominent structures under the Nayaks.

** Volume I, page 353.

expansion of the town of Gingee and the founding of many pettahs and suburbs. His successor, Achyutha Ramachandra Nayak, is said to have built the temples of Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and Tindivanam."

According to the same source, we know that the images of Krishnappa and of his successors were sculptured on the pillars of the temples at Srīmushṇam and at Tirukōyilur as well as in several other temples of the district. The Tiruvikrama Perumal temple of Tirukōyilur bears prominently the marks of the Vijayanagara style of architecture. The earliest part of the temple is supposed to be the *mantapam* in front of the shrine of the goddess. The sculptures on some of the pillars seem to have been removed by later pillagers. The mutilation of the sculptures of these temples has been attributed to the vandalism of Haidar Ali's troops in the course of his descents into the Carnatic country. Among the figures that were thus injured were the portraits of the Gingee Nayaks which had been carved on the pillars of the Kalyāṇa Mantapam in front of the Amman's shrine, which, being 55½ feet by 31½ feet in dimension, is considered to be the biggest of the kind in the Presidency. The Vaishnava temple of Srīmushṇam contains a fine and spacious 16-pillared mantapam which bears on its pillars

the sculptures of several of the Nayak rulers of the period. The sculptures are held to be those of Achyuthappa Nayak of Tanjore and of his three brothers. Achyuthappa is traditionally regarded as the rebuilder of the temple; and the figures of his brothers are known as Ananta, Govinda and Kondalu respectively. Other kinds of sculptures in the *mantapam* are representative of the Vijayanagara style.

In Venkatammālpēttai, a village 14 miles south-west of Cuddalore and one of the Panch Mahals, there are two *mantapams* which are considered to have been constructed by Venkatammāl who gave her name to the village and who was the sister of one of the Nayaks of Gingee. The Mack. Mss. refer to one Venkatapathi Nayak who persecuted the Jains in 1478 A. D. The *Diary* of Anandarama Pillai frequently refers to Venkatammālpēttai as an important place. Venkatammāl might have been the sister of Venkatapathi Nayak.

The great Krishnappa Nayak of Gingee, the contemporary of Venkata I, built the town of Krishnapatam, *i.e.*, the modern Hindu portion of Porto Novo, which was named after him. The village of Agaram near the Porto Novo railway station can be identified with Krishnapatam. When Father Pimenta, the

Jesuit, visited the Nayak in 1599 A. D. the town was under construction. According to the Jesuit's letter, the Nayak "allowed everybody to select his own building site and a piece of land was assigned to each in the outskirts of the city for agricultural purposes. He also allowed the Jesuits to build a church in the town and even granted an endowment of 200 pieces of gold for the building of the church and for the residence of a priest."

We have dealt already with Krishnappa Nayaka's religious activities. He favoured, in an abundant measure, the Sri Vaishnava faith; and in that respect he followed faithfully the attitude of his master Venkata I. His conduct at the Chidambaram temple which marked his religious bigotry has also already been dealt with.

The great Vijayanagara empire, started to stem the tide of Muhammadan invasion and dominion, gradually expanded and covered such a vast area, that it was divided into various provinces ruled by the Nayaks and other feudatories. Each provincial viceroy tried to maintain the prestige of the Hindu power by following the footsteps of his master. Though the battle of Talikota in 1565 had shaken the prestige of the Hindu Empire, the rulers were able to recover in a few years their old power though in a more restricted region, so that, at

the end of the 16th century their state was still reckoned as an important power, capable of using and willing to use its power and resources, before, for the promotion of Hindu culture. The Nayaks paid allegiance to the Raya even after 1565 and continued to do so nominally at least till 1614. Then the great civil war of 1614-17 destroyed the remainder of the waning prestige of the Empire; and the Nayaks, excepting the ruler of Tanjore, threw themselves in open opposition to the Raya. The ill-planned and traitorous policy of Tirumala Nayak of Madura brought about the Muhammadan invasion of Gingee which also surely affected Tanjore and Madura. The Nayak of Madura, in alliance with his brother of Gingee, resisted the last efforts of Sriranga III to restore the power of the Empire and brought in the Muslim occupation of the land.

Though the Empire disappeared before the onslaughts of the Muhammadans, it had left to the Hindus of the south its vast heritage in religion, social life, literature, fine arts, architecture and learning. The modern Hindus of the south have largely adopted or imbibed the ideals of life practised at and encouraged by the court of Vijayanagara; and they still look back with pride to the glorious past that had given such a valuable legacy for the generations that have followed.

CHAPTER VI.

Gingee under Bijapuri and Maratha Rule.

The short-sighted policy of Tirumālā Nayak of Madura brought upon Gingee the combined forces of the Muhammadan powers of Golconda and Bijapur, and forced it to fall ultimately into the hands of the latter, without any possibility of recovery.

Gingee assumed a new and enhanced strategic importance under the Bijapuri governors who ruled over it. According to the Mackenzie Mss., Sayyid Nāsir Khān was appointed to be the first killedār of Gingee, while Sayyid Amber Khān was created its fāujdār of the Bijapuri (or Balaghat) Carnatic.

The contribution of Bijapur to the strength of Gingee and its defences is brought to light by the two Persian inscriptions engraved on the south wall of the inner fort at the foot of Rājagiri. One of these is dated *Hijra* 1063 (1651–52 November) and says that the Hussain Bastion was built in that year. The other inscription, though undated, refers to the improvements effected in the fortifications by Amber Khān, the killedār

Apart from the improvements effected in its fortifications and defences, Gingee grew

in importance on account of its strategic central position in the eastern part of the Carnatic and of its nearness to the rising European settlements on the coast extending from Madras to Tranquebar and Negapatam.

The Bijapuri authorities renamed Gingee as Badshābād and put subordinate officers in charge of the *kīllas* of Valudāvūr, Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, Pālayamkōṭṭai (now a ruined fort near Chidambaram) and other forts in the neighbourhood. The Muslim power at Gingee was further strengthened by the settlement of a number of fief-holders on a military tenure at Dēvanūr, Malayanūr, Ulundūrpēt and other places in the neighbourhood. Consequently, there was a large influx of Muslims from the Deccan to the neighbourhood of Gingee ; and a Kazī or a civil judge had to be appointed to administer the Quranic law to the Muslim litigants.

Since the plantation of the settlement of Fort St. George by the English in 1639, no other place on the coast seems to have attracted their attention till 1673–1674, when a suggestion for a settlement in the Gingee country was made to them by Muḥammad Khān, the Bijapuri governor of the land. The English who were exposed to the inconvenient neighbourhood of the Dutch at Pulicat and at

Sadras and also feared the establishment of the French in permanence at San Thomē, gladly took advantage of the offer of Muhammad Khān and sent Mr. Elihu Yale (later Governor of Fort St. George, 1687-1692) to treat with the governor of Gingee for the acquisition of a port in his territory.

A letter of 20th March 1673-74* refers to the offer of Muhammad Khan and says:—
“The Khān of Gingee, Nāzir Muhammad Khān, having by his letter of 10th of March and by his agent (Hakim Ismail *alias* Manoel de Olivera) offered to the Agent and Council at Fort St. George to give them leave to settle factories at or near Porto Novo and at Valudāvūr near Pondicherry, and to make forts for their own defence with promises of great privileges and a very friendly invitation thereto, and requested an agent to be sent to him along with a present sent by him.”

“The Agent and Council, considering the great trouble they are having for almost two years, and the dangers they are exposed to from the Dutch and the French and also to the disturbances in trade, they did not want to neglect wholly this invitation, but returned him a civil answer with a handsome present

* The Madras Diary and Consultation Book of 1673-74. Records of Fort St. George.

by a servant of the Company to the value of seventy or eighty pagodas with instructions to propose and receive such terms as the Khan shall think fit to grant and to survey the places and rivers offered to them and send a report."

"The said Khan likewise desires, if we find the said places worthy of the Hon'ble Company's acceptance, to send an Englishman or two with peons to take and keep possession of the same and set up their flag to free him from the importunities of the Dutch and the French, who were continually soliciting him for the same with great offers of considerable presents."

Another despatch from England says: "We approve of the settlement you have made in the Gingee country and would have you nourish it by all means possible."

As we have not got any definite information about the success of the mission of Elihu Yale, we have to conclude that no active steps were then taken by the Company at Fort St. George to establish factories in the Gingee country or till 1681-82 when they were forced to be serious in the matter by the oppressions of the officers of Golconda Sultan, within whose territory lay the town of Madras.

The French who were also competing for settlements on the Carnatic coast, got permission in 1674 from the Bijapuri governor of Gingee for a settlement at Pondicherry through François Martin. François Martin, who entered the service of the French East India Company with slender resources, pushed on the projected enterprise which resulted in the founding of Pondicherry in 1674. Pondicherry was a mere fishing village when it was granted to Martin. Though it was small and insignificant, it was conveniently situated on the sea shore and was little over $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles in circumference. The place was later fortified by Martin.

Gingee fell a prey to the famous Maratha leader, Sivāji, who captured it in 1677 in the course of his momentous Carnatic expedition from its Mussalman governor. The irruption of Sivāji into the Carnatic brings us on to the epoch of Gingee under the Marathas who greatly strengthened its fortifications and defences.

Sivāji was able to acquire the strong fort of Gingee from its Bijapuri garrison and governor. The opportunity occurred to Sivāji when the Bijapur court was involved in factions between the two leading factions among the nobility, the Deccanis and the Afghans; and he marched into the Carnatic,

aided with men and money by the Golconda Sultan with whom he had entered into a valuable offensive and defensive alliance.

Sivāji was taken seriously ill in the last months of 1676 and recovered his health only by the month of March 1677. Early in May, he sent out into Bijapur territory a body of “4,000 horse that ranges up and down, plunders and robs without any hindrance or danger.” In Bijapur itself, the Afghan faction became triumphant for the time; and this drove the new regent, Bahlol Khān, to seek the friendship of Sivāji; and the latter entered into a treaty with him through the mediation of the Golconda minister, Madanṇa Pant. This alliance was a short-lived one; but Sivāji was really bent upon the great Karnatak campaign, which has been viewed by Sir J. N. Sarkar as “the greatest expedition of his life.” His diplomacy had won a triumph over the Mughal viceroy of the Deccan; the Adil Shahi government was tottering; and a close alliance was established with Golconda, to which Prah-lād Nirāji, a shrewd diplomat, was sent as the envoy of the Maratha state.

According to C. V. Vaidya * the motive of Sivāji was even higher, as could be gathered

* *Shivāji, the Founder of Maratha Swaraj* (1931) —[Chapter XXXV—Daring Expedition into Distant Karnatak,] pp. 279-80.

from his long letter to Malōji Rāje Ghōrepādē, written from Hyderabad, in March, 1677 during his stay at that place in the course of the expedition. This letter ran thus:—"Adilshahi has been seized by Babilol Khān Pathan. It is not good that the Deccani Padshahi should be in the hands of a Pathan (a northerner). The Padshahi of the Deccan belongs to us, the Deccanis. Our castemen, the Marathas, should go over to Kutbshahi which is a Deccani state. I forget all that your father, Bāji Ghōrepādē, did to my father and I did to Bāji what he did to me. Let the past be past. We will combine. Adilshahi can subsist no longer. You are a Maratha, and in order that you may be benefited come to Kutbshahi. My father Shahāji when he become supreme in Adilshahi, raised to dignity many Marathas, and your father, Bāji, among them..."

Sivāji strengthened his relations with Golconda whose ruler was "for Deccanis fighting with the Northerners" and whose ministers were very favourable to him and helped Prahlād Nirāji in making a treaty by which Sivāji was to have a free passage through Golconda territory to Karnatak on condition that the Kutb Shah might share in Sivāji's conquests there. Sivāji arrived at Hyderabad (Golconda) in *Phalgun*, Saka 1598, (March 1677) and was welcomed with royal honours, while

Hambir Rao Mohité, his commander-in-chief, took a southerly route from Maharāshtra and engaged in a battle near Gadag with Hussain Khān Mayena, a Bijapur captain, and defeated and took him prisoner. Sivāji got a large sum of money from the Golconda Sultan and presents of considerable value from Akkaṇṇa and Mādaṇṇa, his Brahman ministers. With a strong Golconda contingent, Sivāji marched south.

According to the *Rairi Bakhar*, Sivāji explained to the Sultan that if Golconda and Bijapur would but co-operate with him, he could easily conquer the whole of India for them. The Sultan agreed to pay Sivāji a daily subsidy of 3,000 pagodas, while Wilks says that the Maratha received ten lakhs of pagodas in cash and some jewellery besides. With a plentiful supply of cash and an efficient park of artillery, Sivāji compelled the ruler of Cuddapah-Kurnool (Wilks gives his name as Ānaṇḍ Rao Dēshmukh) to pay a tribute of five lakhs of pagodas; he then bathed at the holy Nivriṭṭi Saṅgam, the confluence of the Krishna with a tributary stream, the Bhavnāshi. While the main body of his army advanced along the route to Cuddapah, Sivāji took a chosen body of cavalry with him and struck eastwards in order to pay his devotions at the sacred shrine of God Mallikārjuna at

Srī Śaila, which appeared to him like a ' Kailās on earth ' and " stirred into a wild commotion the spiritual impulses of his heart." He even made an ill-timed vow to spend the rest of his life as a recluse; and only after great difficulty, was Raghunātha Paṇṭ able to argue him out of his resolve. Sivāji distributed a great quantity of alms and built a ghat on the river, called the Sri Gaṅgēsh Ghat, besides cells on the mountain sides for hermits to live in.

The main body of the army had descended into the eastern Carnatic by the Dāmalcheruvu Pass (Kallūr Ghat) and Sivāji quickly overtook it; and he then pushed forward with his cavalry and a body of *mavles*, past Madras, towards Gingee (called Chandi or Chanji in the Marāṭha *bakhars*). There he proceeded to plant batteries for a regular siege of the place.

Gingee was then in charge of Rauf Khān and Nāzir Khān* with whom Raghunāth Paṇṭ had made one of his secret agreements, before he proceeded to Satara to persuade Sivāji to embark on the expedition and who were rewarded with money and jaghirs elsewhere.

* Prof. Sir J. N. Sarkar holds that they were the sons of the late Bijapuri Wazir, Khān-i-Khānān (probably Khawas Khān); while Grant-Duff makes them out to have been the sons of Amber Khān, the previous governor.

Sivāji arrived at the neighbourhood of Gingee with 10,000 troops and encamped at Chakrapuri on the banks of the Chakravati river; and soon the fort opened its gates to him. He is said to have fallen upon the place like a thunder-bolt and carried it at the first assault", according to Jesuit testimony.*

* The account given in some of the *bakhars* would support the capture of the fort by treachery, which is not held by Prof. Sarkar to be supported by any contemporary authority. The *Rairi Bakhar* has the following story about the capture of the fort. "Shivāji informed the governor Amber Khān that he had come down after making treaties with Bijapur and Golconda. He should therefore come to see him. The governor of the fort believed this and came out to see Shivāji, with his eight sons, when they were all arrested and the fort captured. The *Shivdigvijaya* says that Amber Khān came with a nazar to Shivāji, who told him to surrender Jinji, if he cared for the tranquillity of his district, or, as an alternative, to stay in his camp and not return to Jinji, so that the Marathas might capture the fort in any manner they pleased. Upon this he promised to surrender the fort and made a deed of surrender, thinking that his safety lay in keeping good relations with Shivāji. But his eight sons who were in the fort refused to relinquish it and prepared for resistance. However Raghunāthpant had intrigued with the garrison, and the governor's sons found that very few people were on their side; upon which they got terrified and consented to surrender the fort. Shivāji assigned to them some villages for their maintenance and in return they were to serve Shivāji with their vassals."

Wilks says that, on his march to Gingee, Sivāji did not molest the people and gave out that he was marching southwards as a friend and ally of Bijapur. When Amber Khān sent his envoy to Sivāji, the latter told him that he had made his peace with Bijapur and declared himself to have accepted the supremacy of that state. Under this pretence he induced the old governor and his

After Sivāji had got possession of Gingee, he entrusted the fort to one of his most loyal Mavali captains, Rāmji Nalage, who had for his assistants, Timāji Kēshav as *sabnis* and Rudrāji Salvi as *karkhannis* or superintendent of stores. The adjoining district of Gingee was brought under the same regulations and discipline as those of Mahārāshtra and was entrusted to Viṭhal Pildēv Gōradkar (Garud) as subhadar; and he was ordered to introduce

sons to visit him in his camp, put them under arrest and captured the fort. The *bakhars* speak of Rauf Khān as Rup Khān. Prof. Sarkar is of the opinion that Rauf Khān and Nāzar Khān were the sons of Khāwas Khān of Bijapur. He disbelieves the story of the fort having been taken by treachery; and he quotes a Jesuit priest of Madura (*La Mission du Madure*), to prove that Shivāji carried the fort at the first assault." ('Life of Sivāj. Maharaj' by Takhakhav and Keluskar, p. 437, foot-note).

Khāwas Khān was the leader of the Deccani nobles at the Bijapur court and also of the Abyssinian faction; while the rival Afghan party was led by Bahlol Khan. In 1676 Khawas Khan was arrested and put to death by Bahlol Khan who had seized the administration. Khawas Khan's friends took up arms and raised a civil war. Nāsir Muhammad, the governor of Gingee was, according to Professor Kaepelin, a brother of the deceased Khawas Khan; according to the *Sabhasad*, he was a son of the Khan Khanan. Sher Khan Lōdi, the governor of some districts, was an adherent of the Afghan faction; and he did not, naturally enough, join forces with the governor of Gingee at the time of Sivāji's attack upon the fort. Nāsir Khan, according to Martin, was only concerned about preventing Sher Khan Lōdi from rendering himself the master of Gingee; he was informed that Sivāji was coming on behalf of Golconda; and he consequently did not scruple to send envoys to the Maratha as soon as he heard that he had entered the Carnatic.

therein the revenue system already adopted in Mahārāshtra.

Besides the Maratha chronicles, we have got the Fort St. George Records (which consist of Consultations and Diaries of the Councils and copies of the letters sent and received from various places) and the Jesuit letters which give ample references to the Carnatic expedition of Sivāji. Apart from the Jesuit letters, we have got reliable contemporary European records to enable us to build a regular account of Sivāji's expedition into the Carnatic.

One Valentin, who, however, wrote long after Sivāji's death, has remarked thus: "Sivāji accomplished great things in the year 1676, at Golconda, in Surat and elsewhere; but these we pass over as being not to our concern." Nicolo Manucci, the famous Venetian traveller, has also made a brief reference to the activities of Sivāji in the Carnatic. He has written as follows: "Sivāji having no idea of allowing his arms to rust, asked the king of Golconda to grant him a passage to his campaign in the Carnatic and obtained by his valour and determination the great fortress called Gingee. He, like a dexterous falcon, pounced on many other fortresses belonging to Bijapur". An equally meagre account is given in an unpublished manuscript found in

the Archives Marines of Paris. It says:—
“Sivāji entered into the Carnatic with a big army, resolved to take possession of the province and defeated many princes who opposed him.”

The best foreign account of the Carnatic expedition is found in the *Memoirs* of François Martin, who founded the settlement of Pondicherry in 1674. Martin took a keen interest in the Carnatic affairs of the time; and his *Memoirs* which deal with the Maratha activities in the Carnatic constitute a document of great accuracy and importance and have furnished us with the best contemporary account of Sivāji's expedition into the Carnatic. The Fort St. George Records, the Jesuit letters and the Maratha chronicles corroborate the account of Martin.*

* “Martin served the French East India Company for forty eventful years; and, as one who took a keen interest in the Carnatic affairs, his account of the Maratha activities in that region is of the greatest value and importance....He left for India in 1665....In 1670 he was at Surat and heard a rumour that Sivāji contemplated a second sack of that wealthy emporium of oriental trade. He was with De la Haye during the siege of San Thomē; and on the 13th January 1674 he left that place with one hundred and fifty men only, under cover of night. His resources were extremely meagre and consisted of the paltry sum of sixty pagodas that he carried on his person and twenty to twenty-five *louis* in the possession of his friend Lespinau. Thus began the enterprise that ultimately resulted in the foundation of Pondicherry.”

“As an ally of Sher Khan Kōdi of Vālikandāpuram, Martin closely watched the political movements in the

neighbourhood. He was not, however, quite ignorant of what was going on in Western India. In August 1675 he received some letters from Monsieur Baron, then at Rajapur, informing him of Sivāji's fresh conquests at the expense of the king of Bijapur. Martin also learnt that Phonda, an important place about four to five leagues from Goa, had been recently reduced by Sivāji. The French Director at this time intended to bring about an understanding between Shivāji and Bahlol Khan, the Commander-in-Chief of the Bijapur forces, and requested Martin to approach Sher Khan with this proposal. Sher Khan told Martin that he could not write to his master unless Sivāji took an oath on a "Shālagrama" in testimony to his sincerity. Whether Monsieur Baron made any further attempt in this direction we do not know. In February 1676, Martin wrote in his *Memoirs* of the confusion at Bijapur caused by the death of Khawas Khan. Sivāji, of course, did not fail to exploit the differences among the Bijapur officers and he took possession of the best places in that kingdom."

Martin's Memoirs:—Martin therefore, wrote a daily journal of everything that deserved notice since his arrival in Madagascar, and these notes were later continued after he came to India. From time to time, when he had leisure, these notes were revised and reduced to their present shape. The revision was probably made by a copyist under Martin's personal supervision and he made numerous corrections and added many notes with his own hands."

"Besides his *Memoirs*, two big fragments of his journal have been preserved; one of these deals with the twelve months extending from February 21, 1701 to February 15, 1702 and the other contains his journal from February 18, 1702 to January 31, 1703."

"It is needless to say that Martin furnishes us with the best contemporary account of Shivāji's Karnatak expedition. His *Memoirs* constitute a document of first rate importance and were copied by the late Monsieur P. Margry with a view to publication. Margry's transcription is now in the Bibliotheque Nationale, while the original manuscript of Martin has been preserved in the Archives Nationales of Paris." (Introduction to S. N. Sen's *Foreign Biographies of Shivāji*: Pp. xxvi-xxx).

The movements of Sivāji attracted the serious and anxious attention of the English at Fort St. George ; the Council thus minuted in the Diary and Consultation Book of 1672-1678 (letter of 9th May 1677) :—" Sivāji being entertained in the king of Golconda's service and now upon his march to Gingee with an army of 20,000 horse and 40,000 foot had already passed Tirupati and Kālahasti. The sad experience of all countries and places through which he passed obliged us to take care of ourselves and we resolved to strengthen our outguards and observe his motions." A letter from Madras dated 14th May 1677, observes, that in consequence " of a letter from Sivāji to Fort St. George with a request for some cordial stones and counterpoisons, we resolved to send them with a civil letter together with fruits the garden afforded, three yards of broad cloth and a few pieces of sandal wood without asking him money for such trifles though he had offered to pay the money in his letter, considering how great a person he is and how much his friendship has already and may import the Hon'ble Company as he grows more and more powerful as it was obvious to them, especially when the army was very near and was only a day's march." The letter concludes with the list of medicines, (cordial-stones) and other items that were thereupon

sent to Sivāji. On 18th June 1677 a letter was received from Sivāji thankfully accepting the presents (cordial-stones) and counter-poisons, with a further request for an additional supply of the same and other sorts and with an assurance of his friendship and offering a price for them. On the 3rd October 1677, another letter came from Sivāji requesting the English to supply him with engineers to which was returned to him “a civil excuse fearing the enmity of the Golconda Sultan and the Mughals and also the increasing power of the Marathas.”

The English letter of August 1678 refers to the siege of Vellore and the surrender of the fort to Sivāji by Abdullah Khān, its Bijapuri governor. The letter says :—“Sivāji’s forces under the command of his half-brother, Sāntāji, appeared before Vellore which was being besieged for over fourteen months and whose captain, Abdulla Khān, held it very resolutely in spite of great difficulties and the sickness that reduced so much the number of his men that he had to surrender the fortress on condition of receiving 30,000 pagodas with a small fort and country for himself.” An entry in the *Madras Diary* of October 1678 tells us that Sivāji did not stay at Vellore to receive the money and country, but marched towards the coast. The letter of August 1678

refers to “Sivāji being in quiet possession of all the country between the two strong castles of Gingee and Vellore which are worth 23 lakhs of pardoes or £550,000 per annum at 5sh. per pardoes and in which he has a considerable force of men and horse, 72 strong hills and 14 forts being 60 leagues long and 40 broad so that they will not be easily taken from him.”

The letter of Henry Gary from Bombay to the Company at Fort St. George dated 16th January 1677—78, also mentions the Maratha capture of various places in the Carnatic. “Sivāji, carried by an ambitious desire to be famed a mighty conqueror, left Raigad, his strongest fort in the Konkan and marched into the Carnatic, where he took two of the strongest forts in those parts, the one called Gingee (Chindi) and the other called Chindawar (Tanjore) where there are many merchants. With success as happy as Caesar’s in Spain he came, saw and overcame and reported such a vast treasure in gold, diamonds, emeralds and rubies that strengthened his arms with very able sinews to prosecute his further designs.” The Maratha chronicle, the *Sabhāsad Bakhar*, gives a long list of forts under Sivāji’s control; and among them are included Gingee and Vellore. Another Maratha record—the *Jedhesakhāvali*, a bare summary of events with dates covering the years 1618—1697, kept by the

Jedhes, who were the *dēshmukhs* of Kani—while narrating the events in the Carnatic, also refers to Sivāji's conquests. "Sivāji took Gingee and the whole of the Carnatic in Chitra Sudha, Saka 1599 (April 1677)".* The Jesuit letter of Andre Freire, dated July 1678, has not only corroborated the other records in Sivāji's conquest of Gingee, but has also referred to the fortifications effected therein by him. According to that letter Sivāji is said to have devised every means for strengthening the Gingee fort. Extensive ramparts seem to have been built around it, with deep and wide ditches surrounding them. The place was rendered very compact and strong and was also fully garrisoned and provisioned. The following are the relevant extracts from the Jesuit letter of July 1678:—"Sivāji applied all the energy of his mind, and all the resources of his dominions to the fortifications of all the principal places. He constructed new ramparts around Gingee, dug ditches, erected towers and executed all the works with a perfection that

* The *Jedhe Sakhavali* is, the words of Sri J. N. Sankar, "a new and very valuable source for the political history of this most interesting and least known formative period of the Maratha state"; and "its information on some very minute and otherwise unknown points is corroborated in a surprising degree by the English Factory records which no modern Maratha fabricator could have read." It is the most copious of the Maratha family chronicles we possess.

Europeans would be ashamed of." The Madras Minutes and Consultations of April 1678 contain a reference to the fortifications erected by Sivāji : " Sāntāji with his army returned to Gingee castle, a great part of which is very strongly built since Sivāji took it, and there is a great store of grain and all things necessary for a long siege already laid in and he has a good stock of money, besides the rent of the country he had taken." Martin's *Memoirs* have also given ample testimony to the fortifications of Sivāji. They say :—" Sivāji after having examined the site of Gingee which offered great protection gave orders to cut off a part and to erect new fortifications." They also add that, by February 1678, a large body of workmen were vigorously "labouring at Gingee for demolishing a portion of the wall and to fortify the area enclosed by it."

The Marathas were said to have built ramparts about twenty feet thick behind the original enclosing walls, with barracks and guard-rooms built into them at intervals. Such ramparts might have been the work of Sivāji, or, more probably, of the lieutenants whom he left behind him in charge of the place, who are credited, according to Jesuit letter and other sources with the erection of the fortifications.

One cannot believe that Sivāji during his short stay in the Carnatic for less than a year

could have personally added much to the strength of the fort. In the absence of other sources of information to the contrary, we have to rely upon the statement of Fr. Andre Freire. Mr. C. V. Vaidya has said that "it is not strange that Sivāji with his advanced wisdom and high political and military genius foresaw that a life-and-death struggle with Aurangzeb was inevitable and that a strong and extensive fort like Gingee in the distant south would afford him the last stand even if Panhala and Raigad were lost." Actually we will see in the following pages how Rāja Rām, the second son of Sivāji, finding himself unsafe in Panhala owing to the Mughal attacks, took refuge in Gingee where he formed his own government. The very fact that Aurangzeb coveted its possession and that he had to secure it from Rāja Rām only after a prolonged blockade lasting several years, shows that Gingee was rendered impregnable by the Marathas during the years of their occupation. The Maratha nationality survived this Mughal attack by taking shelter in Sivāji's southern conquest during the critical years of the War of Independence.

According to Wilks, Gingee was captured by Sivāji even at the first assault. One cannot believe that Sivāji could have got the fort so easily from the Bijapur captains, especially

when the latter had but recently strengthened it. We know, from the Dagh Register of July 1677, that the Bijapuri captain, Nāsir Khān, held the fort with 7,000 men and defended it against Sivāji who assaulted it with 16,000 cavalry and 15,000 infantry." The fact that Sivāji had to bring down such a huge army to invest the fort reveals the strength of the fortress and hence we could not easily believe that it was taken at the first assault. We have also the statement of Grant-Duff, which is also corroborated by the Maratha chronicle, *Sabhasad*, which says that 'Sivāji "captured the fort by using treachery, having previously entered into an agreement with the sons of Amber Khān through the famous Raghunāth Nārāyan Hanumāntē who was later appointed the Subhēdār of Gingee."

A Critical Study of the Carnatic Expedition of Sivāji.

Raghunāth Nārāyan Hanumāntē is referred to as the originator of the Carnatic expedition by the Maratha chronicles. Both Grant-Duff and Sarkar have accepted the view of the chroniclers. Raghunāth Nārāyan who was serving Ekoji at Tanjore, left his court on account of a quarrel with him and sought service in Mahārāshtra, where Sivāji utilised his schemes for his expedition to the Carnatic.

Raghunāth seems to have concluded the treaty with the Sultan of Golconda which enabled the advance of Sivāji to Gingee and Vellore.

We may admit that Raghunāth Nārāyan suggested the scheme of an expedition into South India by inducing Sivāji to claim a share of his paternal jaghirs in the South. One need not discuss here the right of Sivāji's claim to his father's jaghirs in the Carnatic; and G. S. Sardesai has shrewdly and logically contended that if Sivāji claimed his share in the Carnatic, Ekōji, his brother, could also equally claim his share of Mahārāshtra.

Whatever might have been the motives that induced Sivāji to march into the Carnatic, the scheme seems to have been discussed as early as 1675. In a letter from Surat dated 20th December 1675 (*Archives Coloniales Inde*) Baron Fells De la Haye says that he met Anṇāji Paṇt, one of the ministers of Sivāji, who admitted that if the Mughals were engaged in the north, Sivāji would carry his arms on to the coast and that he had already sent an embassy to the Golconda court to minimise his difficulties, to explain his plans to the king, and obtain some money from him." The expedition, as we have already seen, was launched at a very opportune moment when Bijapur lay paralysed by its internal court

dissensions. Madanna Pant of Golconda had been maturing, according to the account of Martin, plans to recover a part of the Carnatic for Hindu rule and “ to make himself a powerful protector of Sivāgy by virtue of the facilities that he gave him (Sivāgy) to make himself the master of it; and perhaps they had still more far-reaching designs He (Sivāgy) had many consultations with the minister (Madanna); orders were sent to the governors of various places in Carnatic and to the pāllegars to give Sivāgy whatever assistance he might demand of them; troops, provisions, artillery, munition, etc.; the Duke of Gingy was informed of everything and of the fact that Sivāgy was the commander of the army of the King of Golconde and that he had orders to conclude the treaty about which they had agreed. Nāsirmamet (Nāsir, the governor of Gingee) who only sought the means of preventing Chircam (Sher Khān) from rendering himself the master of Gingy, did not make any alteration to the terms and got ready to receive Sivāgy to whom he sent ambassadors as soon as he learnt that he was in Carnate.”

The historian, Robert Orme, has given the following account of Sivājī's Capture of Gingee.

“The want of contemporary record has disabled us from acquiring any regular ac-

count of Sevāgi's expedition into the Carnatic, although on ground in which the arms and interests of our nation have of late years taken so much concern; he returned not to Rairee, as had hitherto been his usage, at the setting in of the rains, but rendezvoused in May of the year 1677, in a fortress belonging to the king of Golconda; from whom he had perhaps obtained the permission, in their conference the year before; from hence he set off with his whole force, passed by Tripetti, and afterwards within fifteen miles of Madrass, but seems to have made his main push directly against Gingee, of which with Volcondah and several other forts, we find him in possession in the month of July...and it was impossible that this rapid success should have been the mere effect of his arms; but that availing himself of the discords which prevailed in the council of Viziapore, he had gained several of the principal members, whose recommendations facilitated his compromises with the governors in the Carnatic. He appointed Hargee Rajah his viceregent in the conquered country, and fixed its capital at Gingee. Whether detained by the prosecution or regulation of his conquests we cannot ascertain, but it does not appear that he quitted the

Carnatic before the beginning of the year 1678." *

The Ultimate Object of the expedition

We have to settle now whether Sivāji was animated by the idea of plunder or conquest and annexation when he marched into the Carnatic. Sir Jadunath Sarkar has main-

* (Pp. 63-64 of Orme's *Historical Fragments* (1805).)

Note. Bombay writes to Surat, June 27th, 1677. "Mr. Child (he was afterwards Sir John Child, Governor of Bombay) (from Carwar, where he was chief of the factory) writes, that Sevāgi is in a castle of the king of Golcondah, where he intends to winter; and after the rains, it is thought intends against the Carnatic..... July 11, 1677. Again, Sevāgi at present is a great way off in the Carnatic country, *where he wintered*. In his absence, Morāh Pundit and Anagi Pundit, and another Brahmin are left to govern affairs, to whom we have sent to procure their cowl (pass) to all generals of armies that shall come towards Surat, that they molest not the English in any part where they come, nor plunder any of their goods.

August 24th 1677. "Sevāgi is at present in the Upper Carnatic, where he has taken the strong castle of Chingy (Gingee), Chingavore, (Tanjore), Pilcundah (Volcondah) and several others, and shamefully routed the Moors, and it is believed has robbed Seringapatām and carried away great riches from thence; and they say he designs, on his return back, to take Bridroor (Bidnoor) and so join the Canara to his own conquests."

Madras, in a letter dated September 1, 1677, which is not to be found, advised the Company, that the nearness of Sevagi engageth all their attention to fortify; they describe *his force and success*, and had received three messengers from him with letters. July 9, 1678, they say that little action hath passed between the armies of the king of Golcondah and Sevagi." (*Ibid.* Pp. 233—235.)

tained that he was motivated by plunder alone. He says: "He could not have intended to annex permanently a territory on the Madras coast, separated by two powerful and potential states, Bijapur and Golconda, and situated more than 700 miles from his capital. His aim was merely to squeeze the country of its wealth and that a partition of his father's jaghirs was only a plea to give a show of legality to the campaign of plunder." Dr. S. N. Sen in his 'Studies in Indian History' has refuted Sarkar by saying that there would be "no difficulty in maintaining an empire situated some hundred miles away from the capital, provided the communications were safe and good."

Martin's *Memoirs* speak of havildārs sent by Sivāji to govern Pondicherry and other places in the conquered territory. The appointment of such havildārs shows that Sivāji had decided to annex and govern the country on a permanent basis. Martin has also praised the Brahman officers of the Pondicherry district for their industry in utilising waste and uncultivated lands near Pondicherry and rendering them profitable. He has noted that the prompt appointment of havildārs and subhēdars for the government of the conquered country and the reclamation and cultivation of unprofitable lands by these officers meant that the Marathas wished to retain their

conquests. Rānadé has written that Sivāji by his conquests and alliance formed a new line of defence on the Cāuveri valley in Southern India to which he could retire in case of necessity. Though Sivāji did not stay long at Gingee and Vellore, he returned to Mahārāshtra to continue the Mughal war only after appointing capable men in charge of the Carnatic.

Martin's *Memoirs* give us a clear indication of the motive which prompted Madanna Pant and Sivāji in projecting the Carnatic expedition of the latter. Madanna Pant had, within two years of his accession to the ministership of Golconda (1674 according to the testimony of Baron's *Letters* and Martin's *Memoirs*) succeeded in getting the whole government and revenues of the state farmed out to himself and only allowing a monthly stipend for the expenses of the Sultan. He had changed the *personnel* of the administration to a considerable extent and removed many Pathan, Persian and Deccani grandees from their charges and put his own creatures in the chief offices. One of the most important features of Madanna's foreign policy was his co-operation with Sivāji in the conquest of the Carnatic.

Even by the beginning of 1676, the Afghan-Deccani struggle at the Bijapur court which

had become intensified by the assassination of Khawas Khān by Bahlōl Khān, had spread to the provinces ; and in the Carnatic, Sher Khān Lōdi, the Afghan governor of Vālikāṇḍapuram and champion of the Pathan faction, made war on Nāsir Muhammad, ruler of Gingee and a partisan of the Deccani faction. Owing to his greater strength and the help which Sher Khān received from the French at Pondicherry, this person was able to defeat Nāsir Muhammad and wrest a considerable part of his territories from him. The latter, being disgraced and depressed, sought the protection of the Sultan of Golconda and agreed to give Gingee into his hands, in return for the grant of certain jaghirs to him (May 1676). Madanṇa now represented to his master that Nāsir Muhammad's request offered an excellent chance for the Sultan not only to get Gingee, but also to obtain possession of Madura, Tanjore and other portions of the Carnatic in the south. But he pointed out that " it would not do for Golconda to send a large army into the Carnatic for the declared purpose of conquering it, without rousing the opposition of the Mughal." According to Martin, Madanṇa suggested that Sivāji should be invited to undertake the conquest, as he would readily agree if he were to be helped with artillery and money ; and he would only retain

certain parts of the country he should conquer, such as Tanjore which he claimed as his patrimony, and give over all the rest to Golconda.

As we saw, Sivāji met Sultan Abul Hāsan at Golconda and completely held him in his grip by force of his magic personality. The Sultan agreed to help the expedition with troops and money and to send orders to all the Golconda officers in the Carnatic that Sivāji was acting on behalf of himself and should get all the help he might need.

After Sivāji took possession of Gingee from Nāsir Muhammad, he refused to put the Golconda officers in possession of it, which refusal, in the words of Martin “opened Abul Hāsan’s eyes to the deception which had been practised upon him” and “made him realise that Shivāji and Mādaṇṇa had come to a secret understanding with each other to the prejudice of his own interests.” * Martin further adds

* Adrian Duarte:—An Estimate of Madanna from the French Records—(*Journal of Indian History*—Vol. XI: pp. 298–313).

Duarte thus explains the significance of Mādaṇṇa’s co-operation with Sivaji.

“Mādaṇṇa’s meeting with Shivaji at Golconda did not represent, as it was intended to appear, the commencement of his negotiations with the Mahratta chief, but their final consummation. We have Baron’s conclusive evidence (Anagi Pent.....m’avoua avec beaucoup de franchise que si le Mogol continuait la guerre du côté de Laôr.....que Sivagy porterait ses armes de ce

that “Mādanṇa’s views were to place this part of the Carnatic once again under the domination of the Hindus, and by facilitating its conquest for Shivāji, to make of him a powerful protector.”

côte lē.....et pour avoir moins de difficulté a l’entreprise il avait envoyē un ambassadeur ā la Cour de Golconde. Baron a De la Haye, AC. C³63. 316-7), that Shivaji had entertained the project of invading the Carnatic as early as in 1675. Since that time continuous negotiations had been in progress between his emissary Raghunath Narain, and Mādanṇa. Mādanṇa had already fully made up his mind to subsidize Shivaji with Golconda money, to enable him to conquer the Carnatic for himself. Only the pretext for letting Shivaji loose into the Carnatic was wanting, and the pretext had opportunely arrived in the request of Nazir Mohomed. When Shivaji finally set out on his mission as Golconda’s accredited agent, and with the sinews of war which Golconda had supplied, nobody knew better than Mādanṇa that Sivāji would never give Abul Hāsan the territories he had promised to give him. As Martin observes, Mādanṇa “knew Shivāji too well not to realize that he would never keep the promise that he had made.” The whole was a carefully planned conspiracy to hood-wink Abul Hāsan into pulling the chesnuts out of the fire for the greater benefit of the Mahratta chieftain.”

.....“We have reached the year 1677 which is, in several respects, the year of the fullest maturity of Mādanṇa’s diplomatic system. Everything that the system stood for—absolute rule at home, a Brahmin administration, the restoration of Hindu rule in the Carnatic, a firm alliance with Shivāji as the chief plank of national defence—all these had, by the year 1677, become concrete accomplished facts giving expression to his aims and definitely influencing the history of the Deccan.”

.....“Mādanṇa doubtless favoured the existence in Central and Southern India of a community of Hindu and semi-Hindu states as a defensive bulwark against

Sāntāji, his brother, was placed in charge of Gingee and its dependencies and was assisted by Raghunāth Nārayan Hanumanté, the subhēdar of Gingee and Sēnāpathi Hambir Rāo Mohité in the general management of administrative affairs in the Gingee country. Havildārs were appointed for the Pondicherry, Kūnimēdu and Porto Novo districts.

One of these havildārs stopped a Dutch ship at Porto Novo in 1678 for payment of customs dues to be collected from vessels touching that fort. The Dutch Government refused to pay such dues as they had already reduced the salaries and emoluments of the Dutch officials employed in the Coromandel Coast. When, therefore, a Dutch ship was stopped at Porto Novo by the Maratha subhēdar, they had to abandon the Porto Novo

the ever pressing encroachment of Mogul India from the North and West. Nothing short of such a theory can satisfy the facts of Mādanna's rule since his accession to power in 1674. He had imposed himself and a Brahmin bureaucracy on the Golconda state; one of the clauses of the Treaty of Kulbarga stipulated that his brother Akkanna should be wazir of the Bijapur state (Sarkar: *History of Aurangzib*, p. 150); he had helped to establish Hindu rule in the Carnatic; and finally he had secured the firm alliance of Sivaji. What other supposition can these facts warrant than that Mādanna sought to consolidate Hindu rule in Central India, and use it as a defensive weapon against the constant menace of Mahomedan India from the North? These doubtless were the "vast designs" which Martin is always hinting at in his comments on Mādanna's policy in the memoirs."

and Dēvanāmpatnam factories as they were under the Maratha control. In September 1678, some Dutch vessels under embargo touched the Cuddalore (Dēvanāmpatnam) port and embarked all their goods, including timber as well as the women-folk and sent them to Pulicat with a convoy. In 1680, however, the Dutch seems to have obtained the factory at Porto Novo from the Marathas.

Sivāji died in April 1680, less than three years after his annexation of Gingee and Vellore in the Carnatic. He had no time to consolidate his gains in the South. The forts he acquired were however garrisoned and strengthened by him, while the havildārs and subhēdars appointed for Porto Novo and other places indicated the establishment of the Maratha rule. The military and revenue system that prevailed in Mahārāshtra were also held to have been introduced in the Carnatic.

Sambhaji and Gingee.

Sāmbhāji, soon after his accession to power in 1680, is said to have dismissed and imprisoned Raghunāth Hanumanté, the subhēdar of Ginjee; this might have happened as early as January 1681. Sambhaji seems to have been irritated by the open rebuke

administered to him by Ragunāth Hanumanté in a banquet arranged in his honour. Consequently Raghunāth Pant was probably ordered by him to be imprisoned. The Madras Diary of 1681 has recorded the popular report that Raghunāth was seized and put in irons by Sāntāji, a younger brother of Sivāji, on hearing a false rumour that Sāmbhāji was dead and that Rāja Rām was on the throne. The Diary has also recorded "that letters intended to be written to Raghunāth Pandit about settling a factory in the Gingee country must now be written to the subhēdar of Porto Novo."

Sāmbhāji appointed his sister's husband, Harji Mahādik *, to govern Gingee with Shāmji Nayak Pundé as his adviser. They arrived in Gingee with troops in March 1681 and took charge of the Government. A letter to Fort St. George of 20th September 1681-82 from the subhēdar of Porto Novo to William Gyfford, (the Governor of Madras 1681-1687), has referred to the assumption of office by Harji Rāja who had taken charge of the government of all the countries and fortified

* Harji Mahādik was married to Ambikābāi, daughter of Sivāji by his first wife, Saiya Bāi, and Sāmbhāji's full-sister. After the Carnatic campaign, he was made governor of the fort of Gingee. On the death of Raghunāth Pant, he was raised by Sāmbhāji to the post of viceroy of the south.

places and to whom he had sent horses and jewels; also letters had been sent to all the subhēdars and governors of the country commanding them all to obey Harji Rāja. The above letter has also referred to the imprisonment of Shāmji Nayak. Probably he was suspected of complicity in the plots formed against Sāmbhāji and the other Rāja Rām, the son of the eldest surviving wife of Sivāji, Sorya Bāi by name. Sorya Bāi claimed the throne for her own son, whose character, she thought, promised better times for his subjects. She did not like Sāmbhāji as he was quite unfit, alike by character and conduct, to rule Mahārāshtra. Each party desired to vindicate its own rights and hence plots and conspiracies were rife at the court of Raighad.

Harji Mahādik seems to have ruled Gingee with considerable authority as circumstances enabled him to become practically independent of his master. Sāmbhāji's absorption in debauch, the baneful predominance of his minister who enjoyed the title (Kavikulēsh) and the increasing Mughal pressure in Mahārāshtra all tended to make Harji Rāja supreme in Gingee. He seems to have been so very powerful that he even neglected to send the surplus revenue to his sovereign at Raigārh.

Attempts at an English settlement in the Gingee country in this epoch

The English at Madras had been suffering in trade owing to the attempts at exactions and impositions levied by the deputy of the Golconda government, Podili Liṅgappa by name. Hence they wanted to escape from this oppression by effecting settlements in the Gingee country. The Madras Diary of 1681 relates to the anxiety of the English to have a settlement in the Gingee country. "Upon consideration of Poddēla Liṅgappa's threat to stop trade and besiege Madras by order of the court, it is resolved to be for the Company's interest to be at the charge of obtaining a *cowle* to settle a factory in the Gingee country—which is out of Golconda's dominions—which is a matter of great security to the Company's investments. The settling of a factory in the Gingee country will keep them in greater respect to this place and secure large investments, that being the best country for cloth. It is resolved that letters should be written to the Maratha Subhēdar of Gingee to grant the English a *cowle* for factories at Cuddalore or Kūnimēdu and at Porto Novo. If we think fit a person may be sent to obtain the said *cowle* as soon as possible."

Having heard in 1681 that Raghunāth Paṇḍit was no more the Subhēdar of Gingee,

the English began to negotiate with the subhēdar of Porto Novo, one Gōpal Dādāji Paṇḍit. He seems to have discussed with Harji Rāja about the proposed English settlement in the Gingee country. Harji Rāja seems to have been very much pleased with the account given by Gōpal Dādāji about the English and showed his willingness to grant the Company liberty of making a settlement on his sea coast. In February 1681, the subhēdar of Porto Novo sent a letter of credence through a Brahman envoy about settling a factory in the Gingee country, offering very fair terms. In April, Robert Freeman (who was serving the Company and found fit for such employment) was despatched to inspect the ports and places in the Gingee country, with presents of five yards of scarlet, a looking-glass and a piece of sandal wood (Madras Diary and Consultation Book, 1681). According to Orme, Elihu Yale, Second in the Madras Council, who was deputed to Harji Rāja at Gingee in 1681 procured a factory at Cuddalore. A ship that was sent from Madras to Porto Novo in July 1682, had to return with the factors and cargo on board, owing to the exorbitant sums demanded by the Maratha subhēdar at that port. Even Harji Rāja imposed an additional duty on all the cloth woven for the Company within his jurisdiction. In consequence, the Council

at Madras requested the Presidency of Surat to procure a *farman* from Sāmbhāji for the abolition of imports and for permission to build a fort near Cuddalore and for the punishment of the subhēdar of Porto Novo.

In 1683, an incident occurred which gave an opportunity for the English to demand certain privileges from Sāmbhāji. An English ship proceeding to Bombay was attacked by the Arabs who were believed by the English to have been hired to do so by Sāmbhāji himself. The English at Bombay complained about it to Sāmbhāji who, however, denied the charge, but promised to grant privileges for the Company's trade in the Gingee country.

In 1684, Gary was sent on a mission to Sāmbhāji for the freedom and increase of English trade in the Gingee country. "Sāmbhāji, from the fear of the English and in the hope of gaining the island of Bombay for himself, treated Gary with much attention and granted a factory at Cuddalore and Dēvanāmpatnam with the ancient immunities allowed to the factories at Kūnimēdu and Porto Novo." Keigwin and his Council are named in the patents as the parties to whom the grants are made.

Freeman who was sent to visit the ports and places in the Gingee country in 1681

seems to have reported in favour of Cuddalore since he was appointed to be the chief of that place in 1682. He did not go there, because he was sent to Masulipatam in the meanwhile. The settlement at Cuddalore seems to have failed in 1682, for we find, according to the Diary of that year, attempts being made to settle a factory at Kūnimēdu. The subhedar of Kūnimēdu who seems to have been kind towards the English, offered them a settlement in the territory under his jurisdiction.

A letter from Fort St. George of the year 1684-1685, has referred to the demand of a loan of 3,000 pagodas by the subhedar of Kūnimēdu. The English wished to favour him as they stood to gain by it. "We have carried out buildings very considerably and by 50 yards exceed Harji Rāja's *cowle* and by 20 that of Ambōji Paṇt for convenience of godown room." Gōpal Paṇdit allowed them to continue the work and promised to go to Harji Rāja and get a confirmation of the grant. The letter has also referred to the great desire for money by the subhedar who had favoured them by allowing them 100 yards square more for godown room, in excess of the *cowle*. The above letter indicates that Kūnimēdu had been granted by the subhedar as early as the year 1682.

The following despatches from England of the years 1682—84, indicate the approval of a settlement in the Gingee country by the Home authorities. A letter, dated 28th August 1682, says: "We shall be very glad to hear that in pursuance of our former orders you have found as much encouragement to settle a factory at Porto Novo and other places in the Gingee country." By the 20th September 1682, from another despatch we learn as follows:—"We approve of the settlement you have made in the Gingee country and would have you nourish it by all means possible and you can also proceed further in building forts with all the privileges." By the 27th October, a letter was sent with money in bullion, asking for an increase of investments in the Gingee country. By the 2nd April 1683, the Home authorities wrote:—"We have great expectation that the Gingee country may afford us new sorts of goods and some dyed calicoes which may be marketed." On the 2nd July 1684, they stressed, in another letter, that they were more interested in trade than in strengthening the Madras fortifications. "Finding the Golconda Governors encroaching so much upon you, we find ourselves more concerned for a fort in the Gingee country, being resolved to defend our privileges in all places. We shall now write to the President at Surat who is

fair with Sāmbhāji, to press him to give you speedy and favourable despatch to build a fort in his country with ample privileges. We shall send you more privileges and if Liṅgappa (of Poonamalle) or any other Governor say anything that you raise more revenue and put you under a customer, you may tell them that the place hath cost £ 300,000 sterling or give them the fort and town and remove yourself to the Gingee country."

The fall of Bijapur into Mughal hands in September 1686, and their imminent siege of Golconda roused Sāmbhāji to a lively sense of the danger to Gingee from an extension of Mughal dominion in that direction. According to Orme, we learn that, in October 1686, he sent Kesava Piṅlē and Sāntāji Ghōrpādē with 12,000 horse southwards to strengthen his garrisons in the Carnatic, with secret orders to seize and depose the refractory Harji Rāja and take over the government of Gingee. According to the same authority, Harji Rāja was perhaps suspected of an attempt to secure his own position by disowning Sāmbhāji's authority and declaring himself a tributary vassal of the Mughal. Kalasha, the vile favourite of Sāmbhāji, had persuaded his master to believe that Harji wished to make himself independent. The latter had harboured no disloyal feelings towards his brother-

in-law ; but his agents in the Maratha capital had warned him of the suspicions entertained against him and urged him to be careful as to how he should conduct himself towards Kesava Piṅglē and Sāntāji Ghōrpādē.

This measure of Sambhaji seems to have alarmed the Mughal Emperor Aurangzib, who detached a large body from the seige of Golconda to invest Bangalore which was still in Maratha hands, before the latter power could concert measures for its defence.

Kesava Paṅt, however, in his ecstasy of joy at the new post to which he was raised, revealed the object of his march to Gingee, as we find from a letter from Kūnimeḍu addressed to Gyfford, dated 26th March 1687, which says that “Harji Rāja was out of employment and a new person has come down in his place.” Another letter of April 1687 from Kūnimeḍu says that “all the Subadars had been to Gingee to give Kesava Paṅt, the new man, a visit.”

Harji Rāja, having learnt the real object of Kesava Paṅt's mission from his friends at court, had effectively strengthened his hold over the Gingee fortress. Kesava Paṅt, finding himself disappointed in his first hopes, treated Harji with some outward respect and recognised his authority to all appearances. This act

removed the apprehension of an open attack on Harji; and the letter readily lent his troops to Kesava Pant, to march into the Mysore country. The straits to which Bangalore was now reduced led Harji and Kesava to forget their mutual jealousies and combine their resources for its relief.

But the Mughal troops had already taken Bangalore, before Kesava Pant could go to its relief; and he had to return to Gingee. Harji is held by Kincaid and Parasnis to have accompanied Kesava on his march to Bangalore. He then returned to Gingee and sent 18,000 horse under his two new allies to invade Mysore. Then came news of the capture of Golconda by Aurangzib, and of his appointment of Mughal officers in the place of those of the deposed Sultan. Kasim Khān was appointed to be the fāujdār of the Carnatic and was directed to march against the Marathas; while Asad Khān seized all the country from Masulipatam to the Palar river. The Madras Diary of 1687 has referred to the unsettled nature of this region at this period in these words:—"10,000 horse having come into the Gingee country commanded by Kasim Khān to war against the Marathas." Another letter from Kūnimeḍu, dated 18th November, refers to the Mughal danger in the Gingee country which "has so much discouraged all trade that

the merchants ceased to invest." These Mughal disturbances necessarily compelled the English factors to fortify Kūnimedu, Porto Novo and other depots. Harji Rāja had hoped to reduce Mysore before Aurangzib should capture Golconda; the Mughal advance had been too quick for him. Kasim Khān and Asad Khān were in the field with large armies; the Golconda governor of Cuddapah had accepted service under the Mughals; and the Hindu rulers of Conjeevaram and Poonamalle (to the west of Madras) were ready to follow his example. The latter held that "the world was constantly turning on its axis and altering the side which it presented to the sun and it was not strange that an inhabitant of the world should follow so excellent an example." Harji Rāja recalled Kesava from the Mysore country and ordered him to attack the coast districts between the North Peṇṇār and the Palar rivers occupied by the Mughal generals. When Kesava refused to obey, Harji Rāja detached a portion of his own troops in Gingee and managed to impose his authority again on the governors of Poonamallee, Arcot and Conjeevaram. Ashamed and humiliated at Harji's success, Kesava and Sāntāji garri-soned all this country with their own troops and thus enabled Harji to recall his own men to Gingee.

On Kesava Paṇṭ's return to Gingee, fresh quarrels arose between him and Harji Rāja ; he now demanded the surrender of Gingee to him in obedience to his master's orders. Harji Rāja had, however, secured a retreating place at Dēvanāmpatnam near Cuddalore, in 1688. Now he sent out a detachment of his army to plunder and conquer on his account the territories of Golconda north of the Palar river, which had submitted to the Mughals.

The Madras Diary, of December 1687, has referred to the activities of the Marathas in the Golconda territory :—" Having advice from the Maratha camp that Maratha forces in the Gingee country under the command of Harji Mahārāja were upon their march with 2,000 horse and 5,000 foot, with a great number of pioneers and scaling ladders, that they had plundered and taken several towns belonging lately to the kingdom of Golconda and committed various other atrocities and that most of the inhabitants left Conjeevaram and other places to secure their persons and estates."

Thus the Marathas were carrying on their ravages with the Mughals ; and fully a year passed with both sides watching each other plundering the country. " No regular battle was fought. Skirmishes and alarms were frequent. Trade was ruined, industry ceased and

men flocked to the European settlements of the coast.”

Orme thus says of Harji Rāja's behaviour during this crisis:—“On his (Kesava's) return the grudge between him and Harji Rāja broke out openly; the surrender of Gingee to the orders of Sāmbāgi was publicly demanded and refused; but Harji fearing that respect to his sovereign might at length predominate amongst the troops of his own command, secured the fort of Thevenāpatam, near Cuddalore, as a retreat on emergency; but to keep up their attachment to himself by an exertion of national loyalty and the hope of plunder, he summoned Keisswa Puntolo to march and reduce the countries to the north of the Paliar, which had just submitted to the Mogul. Keisswa Puntolo seems to have refused any connexion with him; on which Harji sent forward a detachment under the command of two officers, in whom he had special trust, who met with no resistance of any consequence from the new converts to the Mogul government, and in a fortnight were in quiet possession of Arcot, Conjeveram, and Punamalee, with their districts, of which they sat about collecting the revenues, favoured by the season, for it was the end of December.” *

* Orme's 'Historical Fragments of the Mogul Empire, of the Morattoes, and the English Concerns in Indostan'; (1805) p. 158.

The French Agent, Mons. St. Germain, who left Pondicherry on 17th October 1688, reported that on his arrival at Gingee, he found there a great amount of confusion, consequent on an attack launched by the Muhammadans. Harji Rāja, in return for a consideration of Rs. 11,760, allowed the French to build walls and four high towers at Pondicherry, while the actual farman for this was granted only on 9th January 1689. (*Kaep.* 262).

The year 1689 was as bad as 1688. The roads were unsafe for travellers, for both the Mughals and the Maratha troopers plundered the country impartially. The English had to close down their factory at Porto Novo and move to Kūnimēdu and Cuddalore, which were better protected against external attack.

Sāmbhāji who had obtained a great accession of troops after the fall of Bijapur and had reduced all the country south of Panhala, had aggravated his war against the Mughals with every species of barbarity. “Aurangzib swore that he would never return to Delhi until he had seen the head of Sāmbhaji weltering at his feet.” Kesava Piṅgle now became ashamed of himself, and being jealous of Harji Mahādik’s easy success on the coast, ceased to be mutinous. Early in 1688, twelve thousand Mughal cavalry and a large number of

local levies entered the east coast territory under Muhammad Śādik, in order to drive out the Marathas from this region. The latter immediately retired to Conjeevaram and the line of fortified places on both sides of the Palar river and allowed the enemy to seize Poonamalle and Wandiwash; but the Mughals did not venture to attack the inner strongholds, while, on their own side, the Marathas avoided a decisive encounter with the Mughal cavalry. "So both armies avoided each other and contented themselves with ravaging the country-side and robbing and torturing the unfortunate peasantry."

In 1689 Sambhāji was captured by the Mughals.* Harji Rāja then seized the opportunity of imprisoning Kēsava Paṇt and his followers at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and made himself independent. Then he strengthened his army and improved the defences of Gingee against an immediate attack by the Mughals. He released Kēsava Paṇt on the 19th August, but himself died within a month.

Harji Rāja's wife, Ambikābāi, continued to govern the fort and province of Gingee on behalf of her minor sons. Shortly, how-

* For a discussion of the date of his execution, see appendix to Chapter XXVIII of Kincaid and Parasnis: *A History of the Maratha People, Vol. II.*

ever, the situation at Gingee was unexpectedly reversed by the arrival of Rāja Rām there.

On the capture of Sāmbhāji by the Mughals, the Maratha state created by Sivāji seemed to break to pieces. Soon afterwards, all the important leaders of the Maratha kingdom assembled at Raighad. Sāmbhāji's widow, Yēsubāi, and his young son Sivāji (born in December 1680, shortly after his father's accession) had to be cared for. Yēsubāi presided at the council which was attended by such great leaders as Sāntāji Ghōrpādē, Dhānāji Jādav, already distinguished for his great courage and soldierly talents, Khandé Rao Dabhādē who was to become the conqueror of Gujarat, the great Brahman minister Hanumāntē, the chief justice Prahlād Nirāji, Khandō Ballāl Chitnis, who was a son of the famous private secretary of Sivāji himself and had saved Sāmbhāji from drowning during the seige of Goa and had been restored to his hereditary office and, last but not least, Rāmachandra Nīlkanth Bavdekar, who was the *Pant Amātya* or finance minister throughout Sāmbhāji's troubled reign. The council of ministers decided that the boy-prince, Sivāji, should be considered king and Rāja Rām, the younger brother of Sāmbhāji, should be the regent. Prahlād Nārāyan's weighty eloquence finally decided the plan to be adopted, namely, that

while the forts in Mahārāshtra should be rearmed with artillery and have their walls repaired and be properly garrisoned, a field army should be formed from local levies and by reinforcements from the Carnatic, commanded by Rāja Rām; and Yēsubāi and Prince Sivāji should remain in Raighad. Rāja Rām made a bold speech on the occasion, and urged the councillors present to forget all their anger and resentment at Sāmbhāji and to transfer to Prince Sivāji all the loyalty and love that the nation bore to his great namesake.* Yēsubāi blessed Rājarām and assured him of certain victory. Rāja Rām left Raighad along with his two wives and with Prahlād Nirāji, Khandō Ballāl Chitnis, Sāntāji Ghōrpādē, Dhanāji Jādav and Khandē Rao Dabhādē, He went to Pratāpgād to invoke the blessings of its Goddess Bhavāni, worshipped at Rām-dās's shrine at Parali, inspected all the forts that lay on the road and arranged for their strengthening. Sāntāji Ghōrpādē suggested

* Rāja Rām thus concluded his speech :—" Had not Shivaji foretold that he would be born again as Yēsubai's son? Had not Bhavāni told Shivaji that his namesake would rule long and gloriously and conquer all India from Attock to Ramēshwaram? 'I am but the Prince's servant'; 'you must, it is true, give me your obedience, but your loyalty and devotion you must keep for my master. Do but this and I am confident that we shall not only save the kingdom, but bring to pass the prophecy of the Goddess.'" (Page 63, Kincaid and Parasnis: *A History of the Marathas*, Vol. II, quoting from the Chitnis Bakhar.)

that a large army of 40,000 men already organised by Rāmachandra Amātya, should be put under the immediate command of Dhānāji Jādav, and from the base of Phaltan draw to itself all the attacks of the Mughals. Sāntāji himself was to make a daring raid on the camp of Aurangzib himself at Tulapur and, if possible, kill him in the midst of his attendants. In fact, he made a sudden rush on the Mughal Imperial camp, cut off the ropes of the tent in which the Emperor was supposed to be sleeping and carried away its gold tops. Fortunately, the Emperor was sleeping elsewhere and escaped. Sāntāji achieved several other successes, while Dhānāji was able to repulse an attack on his position at Phaltan. But, unfortunately, Raighad was captured, along with the boy-king Shivāji and his mother Yēsubai, by the Mughal forces. Rāja Rām himself was besieged first at Panhala; and when he escaped from it to Vishalgad, he was hemmed in at the latter place also. The military governor of Raighad was in treacherous communication with Itikad Khān, the Mughal general and opened the gates of that fort on condition that he should be made a Dēshmukh (October 1689). Yēsubai and the young Sivāji were taken to the Imperial camp; but they were befriended by Princess Zinatunṇissa, the second daughter of the Emperor, who was

the head of the Imperial zenana and bore the title of Bēgam Sahib. Maratha chroniclers have been fond of giving a romantic explanation of this attachment, saying that the Princess had learnt to admire Sivāji during his visit to Agra in 1666 and conceived a great regard for his fine appearance and gallant bearing; and they even went to the length of saying that she took seriously the desperate offer of Sāmbhāji, on the eve of his execution, that he would demand her hand in marriage as the price of his apostasy.

The Mughals, after they had reduced Raighad, advanced against Panhala and secured its surrender after a bitter struggle; and its chief, Ghatgé, accepted service under the emperor, with the title of Sarjē Rao Ghatgé; but in order to convince his rightful master, Rāja Rām, that he meant to prove his real aim on the first available chance and to return to his true loyalty, he sent his brother with all his valuables and property to Gingee to join the forces there. Rāja Rām was then at Vishalgad which was expected to be the next objective of the Mughals. His council of officers advised him to carry out the strategic plan of Sivāji, to abandon Mahārāshtra in this crisis and to fall on Gingee, from which fortress the Maratha field-army could strike blow after blow at the long line of Mughal

communications stretching from Poona to the Carnatic. Rāmachandra Amātya was to remain in the Western Deccan to continue the resistance to the extent that might be possible. Rāja Rām was to be escorted to Gingee by Prahlād Nirāji who was to serve as his chief counsellor and by a number of noted captains including Dhānāji Jādav and Sāntāji Ghōrpadé. Rāja Rām left Panhala about the end of June 1689 and, after many perilous adventures and a period of concealment in the Bednore territory, reached Vellore in the last week of October and entered Gingee in humble disguise four days later. He then took over its government and formed his own court. His leading councillor, Prahlād Nirāji, was appointed regent and deemed second to him in rank and power. The Peishwa, Nīlkanth Pingle, accompanied Rāja Rām to Gingee, but was allowed no extra-ordinary share of authority.

News of the coming of Rāja Rām to Gingee had been conveyed in advance to Harji Mahādik and to Nīlkanth Pingle who was the latter's lieutenant. Rāja Rām and his companions clung close to the Western Ghats, passed through Sunda and Bednore and finally reached Bangalore safely. But that place had fallen into Mughal hands and its Mughal soldiers grew suspicious of this party, all

of whom were disguised as Lingayat pilgrims.*

However Rāja Rām contrived to escape and baffle all the vigilance of the Mughal officers. Rāja Rām went one way and Prāhlād Nirāji departed by another route, while some servants stayed behind maintaining their character of pilgrims. They were apprehended later on by the Mughals and though they were flogged and subjected to torture, they would not give particulars of the routes taken by their masters. After a few days they were allowed to go free and they contrived to catch up Rāja Rām near Gingee. Rāja Rām had met a Maratha force, sent by Harji Mahādik and Nilkanth Pingle. One version is, that the viceroy greeted the regent with every mark of respect and escorted him with great pomp and ceremony to Gingee, which became the new capital of the Maratha state.**

* A danger that threatened to overwhelm the fugitives at Bangalore where a close watch was maintained, was averted by the devoted loyalty of Khando Ballāl Chitnis who advised Rājarām to go away by one route, when the party had been discovered in their identity and himself chose to remain at the spot and successfully maintained his character as one of a pilgrim band to Rāmēsvaram, saying that the others who had left, were also of the same party.

** Paper 347 in Rājwāde's *Volume XV* is dated April 1690. It contains the news of Rājarām's arrival at Gingee. The Viceroy at the time was probably Harji's son.

A Mughal force which was evidently a small body of advanced troops, had been despatched by the Emperor to penetrate into the Gingee country a few weeks after the fall of Golconda; and this is reported in the Madras

Sir Jadunath Sarkar says:—"Rājarām fled from Raigarh to Pratāpgarh, on 10 Chaitra Badi 9 (5 April 1689) issued from Panhala on 8 Ashwin Badi (26 Sept.) and reached Vellore on 11 Kartik Badi (28 Oct.). The initial and final dates are correct, but in the middle one I suggest Asharh for Ashwin (thus getting 30 June for the departure from Panhala), because it is hardly possible for a man to cover the 500 miles from Panhala, *via* Bednur to Vellore in the 32 days (26 Sept.—28 Oct.) that Z. S. gives to this journey. Moreover, we know from the contemporary imperial history, *Maasir-i-Ālamgiri* (328) that Rājarām went through many adventures after leaving Panhala; he was overtaken by the Mughals on an island in the Tungabhadra on the frontier of Bednur, escaped from the ring of his enemies, and was concealed by the Rāni of Bednur and subsequently allowed to go away. A week or two of time must be allowed for these causes of delay, but Z. S.'s dates leave no room for them in the last part of Rājarām's journey. Chitnis's itinerary of Rājarām (ii. 26—31) seems to me to be imaginary and of no value." (Sarkar's '*History of Aurangzib*,' Vol. V, page 25).

The *Jedhe Chronology* (given in the *Shivaji Souvenir Volume* (Tercentenary Celebration Bombay, 1927) gives the following dates.

Saka 1611, Aswin, Krishna 11, (29th September 1689,) Harji Mahadik died. Poush, Krishna 4, (20th December 1689) Yachappa Nayak, Ismail Khan Maka and others, and 4,000 canals of the Mughals rebelled and interviewed Rajaram through Nilopant at Channapatna.

In that year, on Aswin, Krishna 8, Thursday (26th September 1689) Rajaram rode from Panhala and reached Vellore on Kartik, Krishna, (28th October 1689); from thence he went to Gingee.

Diary and Consultation Book of 22nd November 1687.

Harji Raja at Gingee

Harji Mahādik who had been appointed early in 1681 to be the governor of Gingee, had, as his colleague, Shamji Nayak Puṇḍe. Shortly afterwards, Harji got rid of his partner on ground of his treachery and plots against Sāmbhāji; and he began to rule the Gingee country with undivided power and practically as an almost independent sovereign. Harji soon extended his power over the neighbouring districts, "gave himself the airs of a king, assumed at least in popular speech the title of Mahārāja and neglected to send the surplus revenue to his sovereign at Raigarh." In 1683 he interfered with the affairs of the Trichinopoly Nayak, taking his part against the Mysore ruler and driving back an invasion of the latter's army. Harji's attitude was one of alliance with the Nayak of Trichinopoly and Madura against his traditional foes, the rulers of Mysore and Tanjore.

Sāmbhāji woke up to a sense of his responsibility for the secure possession of the Gingee territory only in 1686, when he realized the seriousness of the consequences of the fall of Bijapur into the Mughal hands. He now sent an army of 12,000 men under Kēsho Trimbak

Pingle, ostensibly to strengthen his garrisons in the Carnatic, but in reality to get rid of the troublesome and overgrown power of Harji Mahādik and, if possible, to depose him and assume the government of Gingee. Just then there arose a rumour that Harji contemplated taking measures to disavow Sāmbhāji's authority and even to set himself up as a vassal of the all-powerful advancing Mughal authority. Kēsho Trimbak arrived in the neighbourhood of Gingee in February 1687; but he could not do anything to prevent the fall of Bangalore and Penukonda into the hands of the Mughal forces; nor could he even assert any definite control over Harji Rāja and Gingee. Harji now took up a defiant attitude; and Pingle had to pretend that he had no idea of superseding Harji and to profess open submission to him; nor could he make any effective endeavour to recover the territories recently lost to the Mughals. The situation at the time of the fall of Golconda into Mughal hands was thus very bad for the Maratha power in Gingee. Mughal officers had been appointed to all important charges, even to the outlying districts of the Golconda kingdom like Chingleput, Conjeevaram and Poonamalle; and Qasim Khān was ordered to proceed to the Carnatic and conduct a vigorous warfare against the Maratha forces there (January 1688). Kēsho

Trimbak had chosen this unfortunate moment to quarrel with Harji for the possession of the Gingee fort; while the latter had carefully secured a retreat for himself in the fort of Tegnapatam in case he had to quit Gingee and had sent his lieutenants to raid the territories of Golconda to the north of the Palar river. They even succeeded in bursting into Conjeevaram and in plundering the land. Kēsho Trimbak imitated their example and likewise plundered the districts of Sēṭṭupaṭṭu and Kāvērippākkaṁ. The Marathas had to retire from Conjeevaram before the advancing Mughals and suffered a severe attack at Wandiwash. Both Maratha and Mughal forces continued in camp, the former at Seṭṭupaṭṭu and the latter at Wandiwash, for nearly a year, each side sending out indiscriminately detachments for foraging and plundering the surrounding country. Harji Rāja received a French agent at Gingee in October 1688, at a time when he was greatly pressed for money; and for a consideration of 11,760 rupees, he allowed the French colony at Pondicherry to raise walls and four high towers in their fort and gave the requisite *farman* for the purpose in January 1689, after the usual delay due to haggling over the amount to be received.

An indication of the anarchy that prevailed even in the neighbourhood of Gingee can be

gleaned from the fact that an agent of Harji Rāja who was directed to plunder the Golconda territory, betook to raiding the neighbourhood of Pondicherry itself and making a sum of 20,000 huns in a short time. The situation continued to be bad throughout 1689; trade suffered and famine conditions prevailed in an aggravated form, particularly in the coast country. The English factory at Porto Novo had to be closed down and the reaction was felt even in their trading settlements further north.

When Harji Rāja heard of the death of Sāmbhāji in February 1689, he promptly imprisoned Kēsho Trimbak Piṅgle and his adherents at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai as noted above, and made himself free from all possibility of opposition from his rivals; but he was afraid of the growing strength of the Mughal arms, and even entertained for a time the idea of submitting to the Mughals and paying them tribute. He finally resolved to strengthen his army, improve the fortifications of Gingee, and “defy the Mughals from its impregnable shelter.” Unfortunately, he died in the month of September, shortly after he had released Kēsho Trimbak; and his wife Āmbika Bāi, a daughter of Sivāji, was in charge of the fort and territory till the arrival of Rāja Rām. Unwillingly, she had to give up her rule to her brother.

Kesho Trimbak who now became the chief favourite of Rāja Rām, put Harji Rāja's son in confinement and squeezed a large sum of money from the property of his widow. Rāja Rām had been instructed to proclaim himself king by Yesu Bāi who, realising that the consequences of Sāhu's imprisonment would be to split the Marathas into factions, urged him to assume the insignia of royalty himself, lest a faction might decline to fight on the ground that the rightful Maratha king was a prisoner. But he was careful to announce that he would continue to be the king only so long as Sāhu continued to be in the Mughal's hands and assumed royal insignia for the time being.

Rāja Rām first aimed at a combination of his forces with those of the Maratha chiefs in the Deccan and of other Hindu Nayaks, in order to raise a considerable army to retake Golconda and Bijapur. Prahlād Nirāji who, as already told, had supreme influence over Rāja Rām was appointed to be regent of the kingdom. Timmāji, the son of Kesho Trimbak Pingle, was appointed subhedar of the Gingee district. The regent, Prahlād Nirāji, craftily kept Rāja Rām, "constantly intoxicated by the habitual use of *ganja* and opium" and "caused the Brahmans who had enriched themselves under Harji to disgorge their monies."

Rāja Rām appointed his own *Aṣṭapradhān*, held his court in Gingee, gave inams and jāghirs to those who had rendered meritorious services and directed his commanders to carry on the war against the Mughals. *Chauth* and *sardēshmūki* were also collected.

The Ashtapradhan of Rāja Rām at Gingee.

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) Nilo Morēshwar
Piṅgle :— | Peishwa or Prime
Minister. |
| (2) Jānardhan Hanu-
maṇté, son of Raghu-
nātha Hanumaṇté,
the former governor
of Gingee | Amātya or Finance
Minister. |
| (3) Shaṅkarji Malhar
Rao | Sachiv or Account-
ant-General. |
| (4) Shamji Rao Puṇde | Maṇtri or Minister
of the Interior. |
| (5) Mahadhāji
Gadādhār | Sumant or Foreign
Minister. |
| (6) Sāntāji Ghōrpadé | Sēnāpathi or
Commander-in-chief. |
| (7) Srikarāchārya
Kalgāṅkar | Paṇdit Rao. |
| (8) Nirāji Rānāji | Nyāyādish or Chief
Justice. |

None of the eight seats in the council was given to Prahlād Nirāji, who was made the

Pratinidhi and given a position superior to that of all the ministers except the Peshwa. A number of other appointments were also made at the time. The remnants of the Maratha army still struggling in Mahārāṣhtra were given a new moral vigour by this assumption of royalty by Rāja Rām and his constitution of a regular government at Gingee. The army was naturally divided into two portions, with head-quarters partly in Gingee and partly in the Deccan. Free-booters like the Bhoslé brothers, Bābāji and Rūpāji, whose depredations earned for them the reputation of establishing “Bhaḷlérāj” or spear-rule, were attempted to be absorbed into the army by Rāmachandra Bavdēkar who commanded in Mahārāṣhtra and by Sāntāji Ghōrpadé who began a systematic hunt of the bandits and gave them “the choice of death or enrolment in Rājarām’s army.”

In consequence of a lavish distribution of offices and jāghirs to his favourites, Rāja Rām experienced financial difficulties and the ministers had to look round to raise money by all means. According to the Madras Council’s Diary and Consultation Book of 1689 (page 97) the subhadar of Gingee demanded 3,000 pagodas as tax from the factory at Kūnimēdu and a like amount from the French and the Dutch factories lying within his jurisdiction.

The Madras *Diary* of May 1690 (page 30) says “that the Marathas at Gingee, force money from the people there to defray the charges of the army which has made them leave Panhala.” As we shall see later, the anxiety of Rāja Rām to sell the Dēvanāmpatnam fort (Fort St. David) to the highest bidder was also due to his financial difficulties. The English Chief and Council at Kūnimēdu wrote complaining that the local subhadar was very troublesome and his “sole aim was to make money and those who raise money are in his esteem.” The above references indicate the penury of the Maratha government at Gingee. Hence they offered to sell the fort of Dēvanāmpatnam (Fort St. David) together with “a gunshot” of land around it to any European power which began to bid for it. The French and the Dutch were also desirous of possessing the fort and tried to make representations that tended to lower its value to the English and raise it for themselves.

The English Purchase of Fort St. David

A Madras Consultation Minute of 4th December 1689, resolved to send the chief of Kūnimēdu to Gingee to negotiate with Rāma Rāja. In June 1690 the actual negotiations were begun with the Raja and details of the sum for which the settlement was offered by

the Marathas were given, amounting to 200,000 *chakrams*, equivalent to 120,000 pagodas. The total included the following items :—

For the Fort	150,000
Present for Prahlād Nirāji	15,000
do. for Raghūji Pantulu	10,000
do. for other officers of the Gingee court	25,000
Total	200,000

The Madras Council continued their negotiations in order to get the sum lowered for themselves or raised to the Dutch and the French who were also very pressing in their demand for the place. A letter was received from Gingee soon afterwards, asking for a final offer from the Madras Council and, in the event of their refusal to accept the demand, threatening to sell the fort to the Dutch. Thereupon, the Council proposed to offer 50,000 *chakrams* as detailed hereunder:—

40,000	<i>chakrams</i> for the Fort.
4,000	do. for the Chief Minister.
2,000	do. for his Brother.
3,000	do. for the Officers.
1,000	do for the Conimēer Subhadar.

In July, Sundara Bālāji the Maratha subhadar of Kūnimēdu, arrived at Madras and

negotiated on behalf of Rāma Rāja for the place, first by lowering his demand for the fort itself and coming down ultimately from 120,000 chakrams to 100,000 but finally offering to give possession of the Fort along with a farman under the seal of Rāma Rāja for a consideration of 60,000 chakrams. The Madras President and Council agreed to this offer and wrote that “it was certainly to the interest of the Company, in carrying out their orders to build a Fort in the Gingee country to buy the one Devanampattanam, because it would cost three times as much to build another, it being reported to be very strong, double-walled, about 500 feet long and 400 broad with many buildings and conveniences therein, all of free and iron stone which, ’tis said, cost the builder, a rich Gentue merchant, named Chinṇia Chetti, above 1,00,000 pagodas; excellently well situated in a plentiful country for cloth trade and provisions, near the sea, surrounded with a good river whose barr is constantly open and capable of receiving vessels of 100 tons.”

The President of the Madras Council also presented a copy of the farman that he proposed to demand, which included a request for the grant of some privileges in excess of what were offered; and it was resolved by the Council that “in as much as if the Fort fell into the hands of the Mughals, it would not be able

to be purchased for five times the sum asked by the Mahrattas while it would cost no more to keep than the Cōnimēer and Porto Novo factories, and the large extent of ground proposed to go with it, would probably yield a good revenue with care, it should be purchased." The President had a private talk with Sūṇḍar Bālāji and contrived to beat down his demand to 51,500 chakrams. The agreement entered into by Sūṇḍar Bālāji was as follows:—"I, Soundee Ballojee, servant to the magnificent Rām Raja King of the Chingie country, &c., have by his authority and order agreed and contracted with the Honorable Elihu Yale, Governor of Madras, and Council, for the said King's Fort at Tegnapatam with ground privileges and all things belonging thereto according to the form of a Phyrmaund now delivered me by the said Governor, &c., for the sum of fifty-one thousand five hundred Chackrams to be paid the King after delivery of the said Phyrmaund and Fort into the said Governor's, &c., free and secure possession for account of the Right Honourable English East India Company. Witness my hand this 15th day of July, Maras, 1690."

Mr. Thomas Yale and Mr. Charles Barwell were sent to Gingee as commissioners to arrange matters with Raja Ram for the farman being signed, but with instructions to insist

upon all the terms included in the draft farman, particularly the land and villages within the gunshot of the Fort with the exception of the Dutch factory and the town of Cuddalore and exemption from taxation for all the Company's goods passing throughout the Maratha dominions.

In the beginning of September, the two commissioners reported that when they gave a small bribe to the chief Brahman at the Maratha court, they were able to succeed and "brought the young king to allow us what towns, villages, &c., our guns could command, the rents &c., free possession to the Right Honorable Company, and accordingly has the Phyrmaund drawn out verbatim to be signed and confirmed the day following by His Majesty with orders for the delivery of the Fort to them."

Raja Ram was also persuaded to grant to the English the control of Cuddalore, together with the river and the bar at its mouth. Hatsell was thereupon asked to go to Tegnapatam and receive possession of the fort and pay the stipulated sum and remove a quantity of military equipment, stores, etc., from Kūnimēdu and the southern factories to that place. Mr. Hatsell's commission contained minute instructions as to the pay-

ment of the sum to Raja Rām and as to the method of taking possession of the fort, after which the “ randome shott ” was to be fired, which was to be done with the best brass gun from Madras that was sent specially for the purpose. Hatsell was instructed that “ it lies in the gunner’s art to load and fire it to the best advantage ” and to carefully fix the marks and boundaries at the points where the shots should fall. Accurate and detailed minutes and consultations were to be kept of all transactions; while a mint was also to be started for striking gold and silver coins. The Fort was to be named Fort St. David, probably in honour of the Welsh Saint, whom, Mr. Yale the then Governor of Madras, himself a Welshman, wanted to honour.*

* The full text of the farman executed by Rājā Rām is given hereunder :—“ Whereas, wee, Rām Rājā by the Providence of God King of the Chengie kindome and territories have at the desire of the Honorable Elihu Yale Governor and Council of the citty and castle of Maddrass and Chinnapatam for account of the Right Honorable East India Company and from our royal love and friendship to them and their nation here condescended to sell and grant unto the said Elihu Yale and for account of the said Right Honorable English East India Company upon ye just consideration and satisfaction of forty thousand Chuckraes paid by our order to our servant Ragōjee Pontuloo, which I hereby acknowledge to have received and do for ourselves Heirs and successors freely and fully give over the Fort of Tevenepatam, with all its gunns, buildings and necessaryes thereunto belonging to be for ever the said English Company proper and rightfull possession, as also all the ground woods and rivers round the said Fort within the randome shott

of a great gun to be in their sole and free possession and Government and that the said Company or their assignes shall have at any time full power and liberty to dispose, alter, build or plant the said ground within the same limitts, or to be for the feeding their cattle, makeing of gardens, or dwellings for their merchants and servants to be soly under the disposure and order of the said English Company and noe others whatsoever and that neither the Duan, Subidars, Avaldars or any other Governors or Officers shall upon any pretence whatever have anything to say or doe within the said Fort or ground thereunto belonging, but that the sole Government and possession of the same shall be in the said English Company and their Governors &c., so long as the sunn and moon endures, to be governed by their own lawes and customes but civill martial and Criminall, and to coyn money either under our Royal stamp or such other as they shall judge convenient, both in silver or gold and that no stop imposition, custome or junckan bæ at any time layd or imposed thereon or upon any goods belonging to the English Company or their servants that shall be either bought or sold within our country or territoryes, and wee also hereby promise to assist and defend you in the quiett and free possession thereof from ye French and from all other European nations or other and all this we fully and freely grant four ourselves heirs and successors to the said English Company and servants. Given under our Royal Signett at our Court in Chingie this August 1690." (This *farman* appears from the Commissioner's report to have been executed on the 2nd of September 1690 and this copy is taken from the Madras Records).

A few months later, towards the end of the year 1690, Governor Yale contrived, as if for confirmation of his possession of the place from the invading Mughals who were expected to overrun the country and get it into their possession shortly, to obtain from Nawab Zulfikar Khan who had been entrusted by Aurangzib with the charge and conquest the Gingee country, a *farman* confirming the English Company in possession of all their factories on the coast. The translation of the Mughal general's *farman* runs as follows :—

"Translate of the Cowle or Phyrwana of Nabob Zullphakeer Cawn Bahadur sent the Honorable Elihu

**A note on the negotiations of the English for the
acquisition of the settlement in the
Gingee Country.**

The first idea of a settlement on the Gingee coast was suggested to the President of Fort St. George in 1674 by Muhammad Khān, the Bijapuri governor of Gingee at the time. ' Having received an invitation from the Cāwn of Gingee, Nāzir Muhmud Cāwn, by letter and by his Egyb Hakim Ismael, *alias* Manoel d'Olivera, to set up factories and build forts at or near Porto Novo and at Vardavur near Pondicherry, resolve to send a civil answer and present by one of the Company's servants, with instructions to receive such terms as the Cāwn may think fit to grant and to survey

Yale President and Governor, received the 18th December 1690 :

"Whereas in the time of the late shameless and faithless rebellion the President of the English, Elihu Yale, Governor and Captain of Chinapatnam, protected and assisted Mamood Allee and other servants of the Mogull, and supplied me with powder with other services, in consideration whereof I made and given this my Cowle or grant. That the rent of the fort and factory of Chinnapatnam with accustomed privileges, the English Factorys of Metchlepatam Maddapollam, Vizagapatam &c., within the territories of Darullichaud, *alias* the Golcondah country, also their settlements and factories of Dewnapatnam. Estlambad (*alias* Cuddalore,) Mamood Bunder (*alias* Porto Novo), Trimlwassill &c., Factorys within the territories of Chingie, according to the former custom and the usual practice of the English, let it remain undisturbed in Sallabad."

and report on the places and rivers. The Cāwn requests that, if the places are approved, an Englishman or two and a half score of peons may be sent to take possession and to set up the English flag and to hold it, freeing him from the importunities of the French and the Dutch."

In April, Mr. Elihu Yale, then a writer of the factory at Madras, was sent to Gingee to come to terms with its Khān; and though the exact terms of the settlement made by him are not known, it appears from the proceedings of the Court of Directors, dated 24th December 1675, that the treaty made with the Khan was approved. But no action seems to have been taken in the matter at all for some years after this.

The Dutch had already established factories at Porto Novo and at Tegnapatam where there existed a small fort built by Chinniah Chetty, a prosperous merchant of a previous generation. In 1678 the Dutch, having already made an offer for the purchase of this fort as against the French and having also quarrelled with its Maratha Subadar—the whole coast having come under Maratha rule just a little while previously—abandoned their factory at Porto Novo and planned to withdraw even from Tegnapatam. They later on endeavoured to capture Pondicherry from the French

and to seize the district of Tegnapatam by force from the Maratha deputy; but these attempts came to nothing. In 1680, the Dutch returned to Porto Novo, having got permission from the Maratha rulers to erect a factory on a plot of land granted to them.

A Madras Consultation of 6th January 1680—81, revived the plan for a settlement in the Gingee country. The resolution runs in its latter part as follows:*

One of the main reasons why the Dutch keep so many factories upon this coast, which being divided into several Governments, if they be obstructed in their business by one Governor they have another place to find and besides this advantage of preventing Lingappa or any other Subadar of this country from being capable of spoiling all our business when it depends wholly upon their courtesy . . . and may be a means to prevent interlopers or private traders from procuring soe good lading as the ship commerce hath done this year, wherefore after due consideration of all circumstances and by advice of the Company's Merchants upon this point; it is resolved that letters be written to the Soobidar of Sevagee's country of Chengy to grant the English a *cowle* to settle a factory at Coorallor and at

* *Vide* p. 240, *supra*.

Coonemerro, also at Porto Novo if we think fit, and a Braminy, a fit person, employed upon said business to obtain the said cowle as soon as possible that we may be ready for next year's business. The Company's Merchants in joynt stock promising to deliver the cloth at our Factory in that country at the same rates and by the same musters which they are to deliver it by agreement here."

The subsequent negotiations have been detailed above. After the proposal of Freeman to settle at Cudalore was given up, orders were given for the planting of a factory at that place; on the 9th of November a *cowle* for the port of Kūnimēdu was received from the havildār of Tiṇdivanam. The above mentioned consultation recorded "the great disappointment received at Codalōūr and the great charge the Honourable Company have been put at towards the settlement of that factory which is all lost and proved ineffectual"; and it resolved that considering "the great tonnage the Honourable Company have requir'd this year which 'tis feared we shall hardly comply with', 'tis therefore thought convenient to order the settlement for a factory at Cōnimēre."

In March 1683, it was once more resolved to plant a factory at Cuddalore; and it was

actually started in May. Another was opened at Porto Novo which had, however, to be shortly closed; and in August 1687 it was resolved to transfer the Porto Novo factory to Cuddalore, as the latter place and Kūnimēdu were deemed to be quite sufficient for the needs of the Company in view of the limited amount of business transacted. In the same month a *cowle* was received from Harji Rāja Mahādik, the Maratha governor of Gingee, for Kūnimēdu, Cuddalore and Porto Novo. In November, it was resolved to withdraw the bulk of the factors from Kūnimēdu to Madras, leaving only one writer, two soldiers and a few peons. Shortly afterwards the previous resolution was reversed; and it was proposed to build a fortification at Kūnimēdu for which purpose some large guns were sent from Madras. In July, the southern factories of Cuddalore and Porto Novo were transferred to Kūnimēdu, it "being now in the nature of garrison having several pieces of ordnance and a guard of fifty soldiers." Kūnimēdu was then deemed to be so important that Mr. Gyfford, the chief of Vizagapatam, was appointed to be the second in council there. On the 4th of December 1689, it was resolved to send the chief of Kūnimēdu to pay a visit to Rāja Rām who had recently arrived at Gingee and taken charge.

After the receipt of the farman for Fort St. David, the English despatched two commissioners, Messrs. Thomas Yale and Charles Barwell, to arrange matters with Rāma Rāja and procure his signature to the farman. Rāma Rāja granted the farman by the end of August 1690 which gave the Dēvanāmpatnam fort and the 'random shot' of land around it, together with all the privileges including the government of the country with their own laws and customs and the liberty of coinage.*

Mr. Hatsell was sent with the necessary supply of money to take possession of the fort, along with the equipment to strengthen it. Then the random shot was fired by the best brass gun "that arrived from Madras. The gun was reported to be so strong that it lay in the gunner's art to load and fire it to the best advantage." The villages which fell within the random shot marked the limits of the English territory. Such villages are known even to-day as Guṇḍu Grāmam or Cannon Ball villages. As the random shot fell on Maṇja-kuppam which was then held by the Dutch on a three years' lease, at an annual rent of 300 chakrams, and besides the Dutch possessed at the time a factory and some buildings at

* Diary and Consultation Book August 1690: pages 64—65.

Dēvanāmpatnam, it was feared that they might give some trouble. But they did not do so and even helped in the transference of the Fort to English hands and also in the demarkation of the limits included within the 'randome shott' line and "never advanced any claim of ownership to any part of the land included therein" at the time. But, a little later, in the beginning of 1691, they created trouble, asserted a right to Maṇjakuppam and even threatened to convert their factory at Dēvanāmpatnam into a fort and mass there the troops which they could get from their other possessions on the coast. This led to "some warm correspondence between them and the English." The Dutch forwarded a complaint to Rāma Rāja who thereupon wrote to the Madras Council that Dēvanāmpatnam and Maṇjakuppam were out of their limits and directed them not to disturb the Dutch or their business. Thereupon the Madras Government took an affidavit from Thomas Yale and Captain Metcalfe, who had both been employed on the mission to Rāma Rāja for negotiating the purchase of the Fort, and sent a copy of it to the Deputy Governor of Fort St. David, Mr. Hatsell, with specific instructions to seize Maṇjakuppam, if the Dutch should decline to rent it from the English on the same terms as from the Marathas and if they should oppose the enforce-

ment of the levy of the customs dues by the English “to force them to reason, but to avoid blood-shed offensively.”

The affidavit of Messrs. Yale and Metcalfe is very important as showing a phase of the real powerlessness of the Indian rulers of the interior over the affairs of the European settlements on the coast ; and the letter of the Madras Council, dated 21st July 1691, to the Deputy Governor of Fort St. David is clearly illustrative of this point, showing how the English power had really advanced to the claiming of a serious and extensive kind of control. The affidavit shows how the Dutch had at first no idea of creating trouble and were even prepared to assist and did assist in the transference of the fort to the English ; and the letter of the Madras Council held that Mañjakuppam had been justly included in the purchase of the English who had thereby become the proprietors of the place and they were justified in establishing their own courts of justice in their acquisitions in virtue of the charters granted to them by their own Kings.*

* The affidavit of Thomas Yale and Charles Metcalfe dated 20th June :—

“ We the subscribers being employed by order of the Honourable Elihu Yale Governor and Council of Fort St. George for account of the Right Honourable English East India Company on a negotiation to King Rām Rāja at Chingie about the purchase of his Fort at Tevana-

patam and adjacent towns, villages &c., within ye randome shott of a piece of ordnance with severall other privileges as particularly mentioned in His Majesty's and Privy Councill's bill of sale or Phyrmaund to the said President and Council for account of the Right Honorable English East India Company to have and to hold for ever as their full and lawful propriety and inheritance to be always under their own free jurisdiction and government, exclusive of all others whatever no exception being mentioned or discount much less allowed of, but only that the Dutch should enjoy their Factory buildings and trade at Tegnapatam as formerly and upon the same tearms and conditions of rent and customes and nothing else agreed to by us nor was there any offers made to us about Mangee Copang, nor do we believe they had at that time any thoughts thereof the Dutch then only renting it from the Duan and as we are informed but for three years at 300 Chuckrams Pan, nor did the Dutch make the least exception against our purchase when the Phyrmaund was publisht and the Fort delivered to us, as likewise our randome shott made, which took in Cuddalore and its circumfêrence much beyond Tevenapatam or Mangee Copang to all which the Dutch Chief Sen Joan Coart &c., were wittnesses assisting us therein without the least declaration or exception against the legallity and free enjoyment of the purchase or any part thereof, nor one word to that time that Mangee Copang belonged to them, to the truth whereof to the best of our knowledge, we solemnly make oath."

Extract from a letter dated 21st July, 1691, from the Council to the Deputy-Governor of Fort St. David :—

"As to your disputes and differences with your unreasonable neighbours the Dutch, we have endeavoured all fair ways to give them satisfaction therein, as also with Râma Râja to doe us that justice with them according to the tenure of his Phyrmaund, but by their insinuation and bribes they take the advantage of a variable necessitous Prince to dishonour his word and deeds to deprive the Right Honourable Company and nation of their just purchast rights, tho' as the Dutch argue for themselves, that Râma Râja had no power to sell their factory being their own proper building which we allow, but the same reason must hold for our purchase too, and

that any collaterall after graunt or sale of any part thereof can be of no right or vallidity, our purchase and tenure being sufficiently proved and apparent by the King and all his Privy Councils deed of sale or Phyrmaund to the Honorable Company without the least exception of Mangee Copang Tevenapatam or any other place within our randome shott, nor any persons or place within said limitts exempted from our Government and customes, and had the Dutch the least pretence to such a right they would undoubtedly have declared it at its being delivered into our possession, which they did not tell long after our peaceable enjoyment of it, besides in their severall papers to us and you they acknowledge they duly paid two and half per cent. custom at the time of our purchase and possession and that they were only renters of Mangee Copang for twenty five Chuckarums per month, these are sufficient instances and arguments of our undoubted rights to their customes and said Copang which by Mr. Yale's and Captain Metcalf's affidavit is confirmed beyond all question doubt or equivocation, they being the persons employed to the King &c., about the purchase and were not only privy, but actors and witnesses to the whole managery of that affair, and therefore unquestionable testimonys against all Dutch quibbles and prevarications, as also those of the mercenary Morattaes who no doubt may be tamper'd and induc'd by bribes to resell the fort too ten times over to the same or severall persons, nay they will sell their honour and conscience too to any that will buy it, a strange instance whereof lately received from our Bramenees at Chingie that notwithstanding their underhand dealings and many great bribes received from the Dutch in this business the King by them now offers for 15,000 Chuckrams, nay 10,000, to resell to us Mangee Copang and Tegnapatam, exclusive of all Dutch pretences and Company too, but we scorne such base concessions as well from its infamy as that it would much weaken our substantiall Phyrmaund, and might be bought in as an instrument or engine to batter it, we do therefore now resolve and accordingly order you to stand by our Phyrmaund it being a sufficient authority and support for the Right Honorable Company's rightfull possession, which you must secure and maintain against all opposers whatever and 'tis but naturall and just to defend our rights; Mangee Copang is the Right Honorable Company's just

purchase therefore take possession of it, except the Dutch will engage to pay to you the same rent they paid the Duan but this to be only for the time they rented it for, when that's expired, take into your own management and make the best of it for the Company; then for the Dutch customes let it be the same they usually paid the Duan, which if they refuse then deny them the boat and people, to serve them, giving them notice that what goods are or shall be landed within your precincts without your licence are seizable and shall be confiscated to the Right Honorable Company as Lords Proprietors of the place, which if they oppose you in, we order you to force them to reason, avoyding bloodshed offensively; and for what you write us about a Commission for your administring Justice and punishing offenders for your fuller satisfaction and authority therein, wee have sent you Printed and attested copys of severall charters graciously granted the Right Honorable East India Company's by their late Majesties King Charles and James the second and confirmed by their present Majesties King William and Queen Mary all which we are humbly of opinion are of full force and authority till repealed by their Majestys, which there is no doubt of since without Laws their can be neither justice or Government, no order trade Conversation nor living; every one will say, act, and take, what they please, without controul, and much more in Garrisons amongst turbulent ungovernable soldiers, but there can be no question of our Authority, the Charter being confirmed wherein we believe your power in that near equall to ours therefore act accordingly, and for your doing justice upon the natives Rama Raja's subjects his Phyrmaund is a further and sufficient power for it, wee therefore for the encouragement and quiet of the place, order and appoint Mr. Haynes, Mr. Watts and Maccudum Nina, Justices of the choultry to try and determine causes Civill and Criminal and to execute according to sentence, lyfe only excepted, which must be done by another Coart of Judicature, and for this purpose wee would have you choose or make a convenient Choultry at Cuddalore, where said persons are to sitt twice a week, viz., on Tuesday and Fryday mornings from 8 to 11 of the clock, and at Tegnapatam once a week on Thursday mornings, to have accustomed fees appointed them according to the custome of that place or this, for which purpose we

Towards the end of August 1691, Maṇjakuppam was taken possession of by the English. The Dutch chief of the Dēvanāmpatnam factory threatened to retake possession of it and hoist the Dutch flag there by force. Thereupon the Madras Council sent a Union Jack with orders that it should be pitched in the village of Maṇjakuppam and a guard mounted over it, to defend it by force if necessary. In 1694, a farman was granted by Nawab Zuḷfikar Khān, the Moghul generalissimo, in which were mentioned eleven villages included within the limits covered by the “randome shott” of the grant of Rāma Rāja.

shall send a list of our Choultry fees to regulate yours by where we would have all tryalls of moment registered by an English Clark of the said Coart and the differences among the Black Merchants to be decided by arbitrators of their own cast, only Justices to examine the bussiness and confirm the execution, this we find to be the most just and satisfactory way of proceeding with them but differences among Christians, the justices may decide.”

CHAPTER VII.

The Mughal Seige and Capture of Gingee (1690-98)

The arrival of Rāja Rām in Gingee meant to the Mughals the rise of a new centre of the Maratha power. Aurangzib was very desirous of crushing their power and wished to destroy them at Gingee. Nawab Zulfikar Khān who invested Rāigarh, was hence despatched to the Carnatic in June 1690. The approach of Zulfikar Khān towards Gingee was thus recorded in the Madras Diary and Consultations of September 1690 :—" A letter was received from Zulfikar Khān, General of the Mughal forces against Gingee and son to Asad Khān, the grand Wazier, Lord High Chancellor to the Mughal, wherein amongst other things he importunately desired the English to supply him with 200 maunds of gun powder and 500 soldiers which if we deny him, will be resented and they will conclude, we side with Rāja Rām and complain to the Mughal against us thereof, to the hazarding of our peaceful settlement and trade overseas. Having been obliged to be friendly towards him, it was ordered that 200 maunds of powder alone should be sent as soldiers could not be spared." In February 1691 Zulfikar Khān had been persuaded to grant a *cowle* to the English

confirming the privileges enjoyed by them before, in consideration of their services to the Mughals by their supply of gunpowder.

Rāja Rām sent his own troops, along with the contingents of his allies, to the north to obstruct the descent of Zulfikar Khān into the Carnatic. The Maratha raiding bands were driven back by the Mughals and an attack threatened Rāja Rām at Gingee.

Though the Maratha retreat to Gingee was itself sudden, the coming of Zulfikar Khān, flushed with his great victory at Raigarh and the capture of Sāmbhāji's entire family, created considerable consternation at Gingee. Rāja Rām had to leave the fort for some safer refuge in the south near his cousin, the Raja of Tanjore. He seems to have sought help from the Raja of Tanjore and also from the English at Fort St. David. The Madras Diary for September 1690 says that "Ekōji is sending a considerable supply of horses, men and money to Rāma Rāja who has resolved to keep the Mughals at bay."

According to the letter of the Madras Council of October, 1690 Rāma Rāja requested Elihu Yale, Governor of Fort St. George (1687—1692), to grant help whenever necessary in consideration of the grant of a farman for Fort St. David. According to Kaëppelin (279)

in October Zulfikar Khān (Dhul-Faqar Khān) even wrote to the French to prevent Rāja Rām's escape by the sea in an English ship."

The miserable country from Gingee to the sea coast continued to be pillaged by the camp followers of both sides. People fled for safety to the south into the Tanjore territory or to the European factories on the coast. The population of Pondicherry doubled in the course of one year, rising to 60,000 souls.

Zulfikar Khān, on reaching Gingee in September 1690, found that the fort was too strong to be attacked with his few heavy guns and insufficient munitions.* The old officials of Golconda whom Aurangzib had allowed to continue in their offices, had proved disloyal; and two of them, Yāchama Nayak and Ismail Maka, had revolted against the Mughal authority in January 1690, and made an alliance with Rāma Rāja through the mediation of the Peishwa, Nilo Morēshwar Pingle and plundered the country indiscriminately from Madras to Kūnimēdu, forcing the Mughal officials to flee to the coast and compelling Askar Ali Khān, the Mughal governor of all Golcondah-Karnatak, to take refuge with his

* On his march, the Khan was attacked near Gururumconda by a large army of the Marathas under Ismail Makh, and Yachama and other poligas.

family at Madras (April). Nawab Zūlfikar Khān was however able to restore Mughal dominion without much effort; and on his approach to Gingee by way of Cuddapah, Gurrukonda and Conjeevaram, the Maratha captains and their allies of Tanjore, Trimbak Rao and Yāchama Nayak were forced to return “without doing anything.” Rāma Rāja left Gingee and sought a safer place and shelter further south and nearer the dominions of the ruler of Tanjore; and the Mughal general was so confident as to write to the French at Pondicherry asking them to prevent his escape by sea in an English ship. Zūlfikar Khān set down to an investment of the Gingee fortresses; but he lacked the necessary equipment of heavy guns and munitions. He now demanded from the English 200 maunds of gunpowder and 500 soldiers. They sent only the gunpowder and pleaded that they could not spare the soldiers. (*Diary and Consultation Book* of 1690, page 80). As many as 100 European soldiers were tempted by offers of high pay to join his army and to form a corps of white men in the Mughal service.

By April 1691 the Mughal army before Gingee had become powerful and well provisioned enough to threaten the besieged with a prospect of immediate and serious assault. The letter from Fort St. David, dated 25th

April 1691, says that “ the Mughal forces at Gingee being considerably supplied with men and provisions, the natives of those parts are very apprehensive that the Mughal power being so great they will not be able to withstand them.” The letter also gave the information that the Dutch were helping the Mughals with their presents and military assistance, by endeavouring to make the English odious in the Mughal camp by giving false representations.

In reality, however, the siege operations could make little progress, as a complete blockade of such an extensive fort was beyond the Mughals' power. Even in November 1690 help had come to Rāma Rāja from three Maratha chiefs who brought him 2,000 horsemen and took charge of the defence works at Chakkrakuḷam in the lower fort. In February 1691, Rāma Rāja was enabled to return to Gingee from his shelter. His troops had recovered from “ their first consternation ” and begun “ to harass them incessantly.” The Raja of Tanjore aided him throughout the siege with men, money and provisions, partly from family affection and partly for promises of territory.

There was considerable internal trouble facing Rajaram in the fort. The captains of the troops who were daily exposed to the

attacks of the enemy were jealous of the ease and luxury indulged in by the ministers and the principal Brahmans of the court. Rajaram was forced, by the growing feeling, to send away some ministers and a few Brahmans of his entourage. But these latter intrigued from outside to bring about their recall and contrived their reinstatement to their respective posts* Rajaram's attempts to secure the help of the petty chiefs of the coast region and to form a confederacy against the Mughal dominion in South India were utterly frustrated by the mutual jealousies that raged among these.

The Mughal besiegers came to be hard pressed even in the course of 1691; and the activity of the Maratha marauding bands prevented the supply of sufficient quantities of grain to the camp of Zūlfikar Khān. Several Golconda officers who had accompanied him now deserted to the enemy side. One, Sayyid Laṣkar Khān, brought a welcome supply of provisions and money to Zūlfikar Khān's camp from Cuddapah which gave much relief. Zūlfikar Khān had to report to the Emperor that "the enemy were hemming him around, stopping his supply and provisions and that he needed reinforcements urgently."

* *Memoirs of François Martin* (1934). Vol. III, p. 151.

Hence Asad Khān, the Wazir and father of Zūlfikar Khān, was sent to Gingee to hasten to his son's aid ; while Prince Kam Baksh, the last and most-favoured son Aurangzib, who was then engaged in the siege of Wagingera, was ordered to march to the Carnatic and strengthen the position of the Mughals. In June 1691 the arrival of Asad Khān at Gingee was recorded in the Madras Diary thus: "Having advice of the Grand Wazir Asad Khān coming with an army to the assistance of his son Zūlfikar Khān at Gingee, to whom we think it would be absolutely necessary to send some presents to compliment and make him a visit with a suitable present to engage his favour to the Company, he having been the prime minister and chief person of state and also the chief person in the Mughal court."

Professor Sir Jadunath Sarkar explains the cause of the delay in the march of Asad Khān to the Carnatic, who, though he had often expressed a desire to see his son, now hesitated to go to help him in sore straits. "He had frequently taunted the other imperial generals with failure against the Marathas and bragged of what he could have done, saying:— 'His Majesty has not charged me with any enterprise. When he does so, he will see what 'Turk' means. This speech had been

reported to the Emperor, and now, on hearing Asad Khān's supine inactivity, Aurangzib turned to his librarian and said, "His Turkship is over. How runs the proverb?" And then they both recited it,—'Don't brag again, as your boast (Turki) has come to an end!' This verse was embodied in a despatch now sent to Asad Khān."*

After this reproof from his master, Nawab Asad Khān had really to go; and having been joined in the meantime by Prince Kam Baksh both proceeded towards Gingee which they reached in December 1691.** The advance of Kam Baksh at Gingee was known to the English at Fort St. George, who wished to send him a present to the amount of 2,000 pagodas with other rarities including arms and cloth (July 1691). "The news of the Mughal's son (Prince Kam Baksh) coming down towards Gingee being now confirmed to us and Asad Khān the Wazir, and himself, being two of the greatest peers in the kingdom, it was thought necessary that a fitting person should be sent

* J.N. Sarkar's 'History of Aurangzib,' Vol. V, p. 75.

** According to Scott, Asad Khan met the Prince at Cuddapah (sixty kos from Gingee) and accompanied him to Conjeevaram, while Rao Dalpat was despatched with reinforcements and a large amount of treasure to Zulfikar Khān. Martin says that the Prince and the Minister reached the neighbourhood of the Mughal camp in October 1691.

with a considerable present to the amount of 2,000 pagodas with rarities including arms and cloth.”

In the meantime, Zūlfikar Khān had suspended active operations on the fortifications on Gingee and turned to the south to levy contributions from the chiefs of that region. With the help of Ali Mardan Khān, the fāujdār of Conjeevaram, he marched with a small body of troopers against the kingdoms of Tanjore and Trichinopoly and returned with the tributes collected from their chiefs. He returned to Gingee by way of Cuddalore and contrived to capture Tiruvaṇṇāmalai by the end of 1691. He also asked the French at Pondicherry to seize the neighbouring fort of Valudāvūr for him; but they would not agree to any open hostilities with the Marathas. Thus the year 1691 passed “without any decisive success for the imperialists.”

Zūlfikar's plundering raid was closely followed by Maratha hordes who added to the desolation of the country, and the people had to hide themselves in the jungles of the poligar chiefs. Martin thus comments on Zūlfikar Khān's procrastination of the operations:— “The conduct of the general appeared suspicious by his lack of application to make himself master of Gingee.” The Khān wrote to Rajaram to give up the fort to him as a

result of negotiation and that after Kam Baksh should assume charge, he could no longer secure his own terms and would lose the advantageous conditions he now offered. Thus, in the words of Martin:—"The greatest hope of Rajaram and his Brahman ministers was neither in their forces, nor in the help (from Tanjore) which they anticipated, but in the understanding that they had with the general Zulfikar Khān." *

In spite of the help rendered by Asad Khān and the Prince, the year 1692 was not propitious to the Mughals. As the fortifications of Gingee comprehended a group of hills with forts and embrasures and walls, well furnished with artillery and with an abundance of provisions and military stores, it was found impossible from the very beginning to invest the whole area intensively; and hence posts were allotted to different commanders who were stationed on all sides of the place; and attempts were made to cut off any communications of the beseiged. Zūlfikar Khān took up a post opposite the eastern or Pondicherry gate. Asad Khān and the Prince lay encamped on the road be-

* Further, Martin wrote that to all outward appearances the Khan offered to Rajaram Vellore and all the territories dependent upon it in return for Gingee, but at the same time sent secret envoys to him urging him not to give in. (*Memoirs*—Vol. III—p. 173).

yond the north gate leading from Kriṣṇagiri to Singavaram hill. Ismail Khān Makha who had again returned to the Mughal allegiance and others were stationed in an outpost north-west of the fort near Rājagiri. Each of these camps was walled round for safety. The gate of Shaitān Dāri (or Port-du-Diable of Orme) could not be blockaded; and “the garrison freely came and went out by it and brought in provisions whenever they liked.” An outpost under Kākār Khān guarded the approaches through the Vēṭṭavalam wood towards the south-west by which supplies could be brought in. On the whole the line of investment was neither intense nor effective.

The beseiged shot at and threatened the Prince's camp, though Zūlfikar Khān had strengthened the guards at that post. One night a Maratha force, 5,000 strong, sallied out of the north gate and were only forced back by a gigantic effort on the part of all the Mughal besiegers. Zūlfikar Khān had, however, the prince's camp transported by the side of his own, and Sayyid Laṣhkar Khān was assigned to take charge of the Prince's outpost. Zūlfikar Khān next selected Chaṇdrāyan Drug as the objective of his attacks and ran trenches around it as a first measure. Then he began a bombardment of the hill as well as of the Pondicherry gate.

Then “ rains set in with great fury. Grain again became exceedingly scarce and the constant strain of the siege was beyond measure fatiguing to the troops.*

As Prof. Sarkar well remarks, all the exertions of Zūlfikar Khān became “ a mere show as the country around knew well.” The entire district round Gingee looked like a big lake on account of the heavy rains. The Madras Diary of July 1692 has recorded the disturbed state of the country due to the wars.

At the close of the rainy season, a body of 30,000 Maratha horse advanced for the assistance of Rāma Rāja at Gingee, under the able commanders, Sāntāji Ghōrepādē and Dhānāji Jādhav. As there were not sufficient troop to keep an intensive blockade and at the same time oppose the enemy, the various detachments which had been sent out for foraging and collecting plunder were recalled by Zūlfikar Khān to join the main army. All the Mughal outposts were ordered to fall in on the main army as their scattered positions could no longer be added. As a consequence, Sayyid Laṣhkar Khān and Kākār Khān quickly returned to Gingee and joined their general. But Ismail Khān Makha, who was stationed

* *History of the Deccan by Ferishta* edited by Scott: Vol. II, page 87.

at a somewhat distant place, made some delay, being engaged and employed in collecting his baggage and provisions, when Dhānāji arrived. He was therefore attacked by Dhānāji's army and was wounded and taken a prisoner with much booty into Gingee. According to Scott, he was later released by the kindness of Ajit Naire on account of the latter's former friendship.

Sāntāji who first burst upon Conjeevaram, met Ali Mardan Khān, the Mughal fāujdār of that place; the latter sallied out to encounter the Maratha army, not being aware of its real strength. His small force was hemmed round and he himself was captured, along with 1,500 horses and six elephants. All the stores and weapons of his army were looted (December 1692). He was then taken to Gingee and held up to ransom. The seizure of both Ali Mardan Khān, the fāujdār of Conjeevaram and Ismail Khān Makha by the Marathas is recorded in the Madras Diary for 1693.

A letter from Yāchama Nayak to the Captain More (Governor) of Chenṇapatnam (Madras) says:—"You are very sensible that the Mughal army against this place cannot effect their design after a long time lying before it.....Since 30,000 of our horses came from above, we took Ali Mardan Khān and Makh Ismail Khān prisoners and had kept them at

Gingee." (Diary and Consultation Book, 1693 : 2nd January, pp. 22-23).

Upon the capture of Ali Mardan Khān, many people fled from Conjeevaram to Madras. By the 23rd of December 1692, an Armenian merchant came to the President of Fort St. George (Mathaniel Higginson 1692-1698) and told him that, as a result of a letter from Pulicat from the brother-in-law of Ali Mardan Khān at Gingee, the Marathas had offered his (Ali Mardan Khān's) liberty for a lakh of pagodas. He requested the Madras President to receive jewels and money to that amount into his custody and then write to Rāma Rāja engaging to pay that sum on the arrival of Ali Mardan Khān at Madras (Madras Diary and Consultation Book, 1693 : page 9).

The English, however, did not like to interfere at first. Some days later, the Armenian merchants brought pressure on the government by their influence to interest itself in the release of Ali Mardan Khān by engaging to pay the ransom amount to Rāma Rāja. Thus Ali Mardan Khān was released. It was through the efforts of his brother-in-law, Ali Qādir, that this sum was raised.

After their seizure of Ali Mardan Khān, the fāujdar of Kānchi, and Ismail Khān Makha, the Marathas appointed one, Kēsava Rāman,

as their subhadar of Conjeevaram and strengthened him with the command of 1,000 horse and 4,000 foot in January 1693. Dhānāji Jādav led frequent attacks on the siege-posts of the Mughals; and when he joined his forces with those of Sāntāji, Zūlfikar Khān became alarmed, abandoned his outposts and concentrated the scattered troops under his own command. Before the siege-camp of Ismail Khān on the western side of the fort could be dismantled and transferred to the head-quarters of the Mughal general, he was intercepted by the enemy and captured along with 500 horse and 2 elephants and carried into Gingee a prisoner.* It was after this strenuous victory that Rāma Rāja issued a proclamation, declaring the assumption of the government of Golconda-Karnatak by the Maratha state and appointing Maratha governors to take charge of its head-quarters stations of Conjeevaram and Cuddapah.

The revival of Maratha activity and their predominance in the surrounding country put a stop to the plentiful supply of grain to the Mughal camp. Letters from the Emperor's court were also not regularly received. The Mughal army outside Gingee was besieged and its condition became critical by reason of internal disputes. Prince Kam Baksh, who was a

foolish young man, had opened a secret correspondence with Rāja Rām. The Marathas were greatly elated by their securing such an ally in the enemy's camp. Zūlfikar Khān had however learnt of the prince's deceit and kept him under surveillance. Dalpat Rao, the Khān's bravest and most trusted lieutenant, was posted at the Prince's camp in constant attendance on him. Moreover, the arrival of Sāntāji and Dhānāji increased the difficulties of the Mughals. The grain supply of the siege camp was cut off. Famine began to rage among the multitude and communications were rendered unsafe. Alarming rumours of the Emperor's death arose immediately, which the Marathas gladly spread and exaggerated. It was said that Aurangzib was dead and that Shāh Âlam had succeeded to the imperial throne. Kam Baksh was naturally afraid of losing the chances of his succession to the throne and of his possible degradation under the new regime. His only hope of safety, as he was an enemy of Asad Khān, lay in an alliance with the Marathas. He thought of escaping into the fort of Gingee with his family by night, of effecting an alliance with the Marathas and then trying to win the throne of Delhi with their aid. However, Kam Baksh could not pursue his plans for fear of Asad Khān and his men posted in

his camp, while Zūlfikar Khān had many spies even among the Marathas. The latter quickly learnt of all the Prince's projects and secured from Aurangzib to whom he duly reported all the happenings, an order to keep him under surveillance and arrest. Dalpat Rao was ordered to keep watch over the Prince's camp and to prevent his moving about freely.

The activities of Kam Baksh were duly conveyed to Asad Khān by the spies of Zūlfikar Khān who also reported everything to the leading officers of the imperial army and decided that the Prince should be kept under close watch. The siege operations were then suspended for some time. "The Prince, in the intoxication of youth and under the influence of evil counsellors, made the entire long journey (from Kadapa) to Jinji on horseback, prolonging it still further by hunting and sight-seeing on the way. Asad Khān, as bound by etiquette, had to ride on horseback alongside the prince, in spite of his great weakness and the infirmities of old age. It embittered his feelings towards the prince, and wicked men on both sides aggravated the quarrel by their intervention."

"After reaching Jinji, the prince acted still more foolishly. Through the medium of

some reckless and mad men he opened a secret correspondence with Rājarām.” *

Zūlfikar Khān is reported to have burst his big guns by firing excessive charges of powder and abandoned them where they stood. Lewis Terrill, one of the soldiers who served under Zūlfikar Khān in the siege of Gingee, has given the following account of the affair, as recorded in the Madras Diary, dated the 30th January 1693.

“Two months since Zūlfikar had ordered to split all the great and brass guns, which he supposed was occasioned by the Mughal’s death, whereof he also heard reports that Kam Baksh attempting to go over to Rāma Rāja was seized by Zūlfikar Khān and kept a prisoner.” The *Ma’āthiri Alamgiri* (357) says that nails were driven into the touch holds of the guns **.

The Marathas fell upon the Mughals whenever they gained an opportunity. They

* J. N. Sarkar’s ‘History of Aurangzib,’ Vol. V, p. 81.

** do. do. do. p. 84, foot-note. The *Ma’āthir-i-Ālamgiri*, (a chronogram = 1122/17-10-11, the date of completion) is a history of the reign of Aurangzib, the account of the first ten years which was a later addition, being an abridgement of the *Ālamgīr-Nāmah* (see Elliot and Dawson: *History of India*, Vol. VII; pp. 181—197 and *Persian Literature, A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*, by C. A. Storey, Section II; Fasciculus 3, M. History of India (1939): pp. 593—4.

hemmed round the Mughal army; and “the audacity of the infidels passed all bounds and death stared Muslims in the face.” Zūlfikar and his men fought very bravely. In the great battle that ensued, the Marathas lost 3,000 foot and 350 cavalry, while the imperialists lost only 400 troopers, 400 horses and 8 elephants.” *

In the meanwhile, the plot of Prince Kam Baksh who wished to be freed of the vigilant surveillance of Asad Khān and Zūlfikar Khān, and to arrest Zūlfikar Khān, however leaked out and Zūlfikar Khān had him arrested immediately. Kam Baksh is reported to have come out of the harem by the main gate. He was dragged bare-footed before Asad Khān who first rebuked him for his bad conduct but then treated him with marked kindness and the consideration due to his rank.

Zūlfikar Khān, thereupon endeavoured to restore harmony and unity of control over the singhor army by a lavish distribution of presents and by assurances of the ultimate

* Zūlfikar Khān had burst his big guns and been forced to abandon them. He started the attack from the trenches; but as his front was four miles in width and the walls were only at a distance of half a mile from his front line, it was easy for the Marathas to effect a sortie and a combination with their own troops outside. Nevertheless, the Mughal general contrived to drive back the besiegers behind the walls.

success of the siege operations. The Marathas hoped to profit by the internal difficulties of the besiegers and tried “an astonishing amount of tumult and disturbance near the camp from dawn to sun-set.” Zūlfikar Khān however overcame the crisis successfully.

Sāntāji Ghōrepāde, flushed with his success over Ali Mardan Khān of Conjeevaram, now arrived at Gingee and added to the attacks against Zūlfikar Khān. There was almost daily fighting and the Marathas were only kept away with difficulty from attacking the Mughal foraging parties.

Bhimsen, an eye-witness, has given the following account: “The enemy exceeded 20,000 men, while the Imperialists were a small force, a great part of which being employed in guarding the prince and the camp.” The whole brunt of the fighting fell on Zūlfikar Khān and Dalpat Rao who however fought like heroes.

The scarcity of grain became so great in the Mughal camp as to make the situation intolerable; and Zūlfikar Khān had to march to Wandiwash, 24 miles north-east of Gingee, in order to get an adequate supply of food grains. Under cover of darkness his soldiers plundered the corn merchants and “fell on the helpless grain-dealers and carried off whatever they could seize.” In the morning, the

general himself collected the grain left unplundered by his men and returned to Gingee. But Sāntaji with 20,000 men barred his path before Dēsūr, 10 miles south of Wandiwash. The Mughals after a hard fight contrived to reach the fort of Dēsūr and encamped at the foot of its walls. Zūlfikar's retreat to Wandiwash for provisions, and his forced stay at Dēsūr Fort are recorded in the Madras Diary of January 1693. In their further progress, the Mughals were attacked by the Marathas and forced to fight a most determined engagement. It was only the bravery of Dalpat Rao that saved the situation; he and his Bundelas got the credit of saving Zūlfikar Khān's division and consequently the main army before Gingee.*

A letter to the Governor from Conjeevaram, dated 8th January 1693, refers to the imprisonment of Ali Mardan Khān and Ismail Makha. The same letter says:—"Zūlfikar

* The Maratha attack is thus described: "They fired so many muskets that the soldiers and banjaras of our force were overpowered. Bullets were specially aimed at the elephants ridden by the imperial commanders. Many of these animals were hit. Regardless of the enemy fire, Rao Dalpat and his Bundelas boldly charged to clear a way ahead.....The transport animals and guns stuck in the mud of the rice-fields, artillery munition ran short, no powder or shot was left with any musketeer," (J. N. Sarkar's 'History of Aurangzib,' Vol. V, pp. 88—9).

Khān, lately marching out of the Mughal camp to Wandiwash to get provisions, and Sāntāji Ghōrepāde meeting him with 20,000 men, forced him to take shelter in Dēsūr fort, so that he can't get out of it being surrounded by the Marathas." (Madras Diary and Consultation Book, 1693, page 23). By letters sent by Yāchama Nayak from Gingee and from Conjeevaram and by means of daily reports of their spies employed in those parts, the English were able to record in their Diary of 1693 (under date January 10) that "Zūlfikar Khān and Asad Khān are reduced into such straits by the Marathas and that unless there is a speedy arrival of men and provisions they will be forced to quit the siege of Gingee and withdraw their forces out of those parts. The Marathas who have grown very strong of late by a recruit of numbers have encircled Zūlfikar Khān at Dēsūr, a place of little defence, and Asad Khān in the camp. There have also been various reports for ten days past of the Mughal's death and Shāh Âlam's succession to the throne." Lewis Terrill's report of the war, recorded on January 30, 1693, has also referred to the camp "being reduced for extreme want of provisions for men and cattle so that if they had stayed longer they would have been starved to death." It further tells that "they made truce with Rāma Rāja

for two days in which time Zūlfikar Khān removed to Wandiwash, but for want of camels and oxen he was forced to leave much of their baggage behind to the destruction of the Marathas, which gave occasion to the report that peace was made.”

To return to Zūlfikar Khān's movements after the battle of Dēsūr:—As already told the Khān halted at Dēsūr for a day or two and resumed his march. The Marathas made a determined attack by firing many muskets which overpowered the corn merchants and the soldiers. Dalpat Rao and the other Bundelas boldly withstood the attacks and thus saved the position of Zūlfikar Khān's camp before Gingee.

The grain brought from Wandiwash was not at all sufficient and thus the condition of the starving imperialist troops became very bad indeed. Many men daily walked over to the Maratha camp at the foot of Gingee where provisions were plentiful, bought, cooked and ate the grain there and returned without taking anything back with them. The Madras Diary of January 8 (1693), has recorded a letter from Conjeevaram where it is said :—“The Mughal army being before Gingee, Dhānāji Jādhav and several other great persons surrounded the army, cutting them off

from all manner of provisions coming to the Prince and Asad Khān, whereupon many of the Mughal merchants and shop-keepers came to us upon granting them a *cowle* for safe conduct." Every day from dawn to sunset the Marathas assembled round the Mughal camp and made threatening demonstrations. "No aid came from any source except from the gracious to the lowly; neither money nor food stuff arrived. All the army high and low alike were in a distressed condition."

Asad Khān now made overtures of peace to Rāja Rām and offered heavy bribes to enable him to retreat to Wandiwash unmolested. The Marathas wished to continue the war and drive the Mughals to desperation as they were suffering keenly from famine conditions. Asad Khān successfully induced Rāja Rām to agree to his proposal; and the latter, contrary to the advice of his followers, proposed a truce with the Mughals if he could thereby secure, with the guarantee of the Wazir, a permanent peace with Aurangzib. Dalpat Rao, however, strongly advised Zulfikar Khān and Asad Khān against complying with Rāja Rām's request and remarked that any truce with him would be followed by the anger of the Emperor and by their own disgrace and even offered to give away his personal effects for the army expenses.

In the meantime, the artillery men who were dying of hunger were moving to their camp to Wandiwash. Owing to long continued starvation, most of the horses, camels and other animals of the camp had perished. The retreat to Wandiwash was very hasty and many had to leave behind their property and even friends and relatives. They reached Wandiwash in three days, on 22nd January 1693. It was the resolve of the gunners to retreat that produced this miserable move.

Kasim Khān, the newly appointed faujdār of Conjeevaram in succession to Ali Mardan Khān, came with supplies and a strong force from Cuddapah, but was intercepted near Kāvēripāk by Sāntāji from proceeding further south and had to shut himself up in Conjeevaram. Zulfikar Khān, however, had him escorted safely to Wandiwash (beginning of February 1693).

The arrival of food supplies in the Mughal camp and the report of the Mughal Emperor's safety brought rejoicings to the imperialists; and Bhimsen remarked that "life came back to our bodies." Zulfikar Khān remained at Wandiwash for four months (February to May 1693) and the siege of Gingee was therefore practically abandoned for the season. Asad Khān and Zulfikar Khān were anxious

as to how the Emperor would regard his son's incarceration, for already there had spread wild rumours of his growing anger towards his generals. Aurangzib first ordered that the Prince should be brought before him in charge of Asad Khān. Prince Azām, the second surviving son of the Emperor, was posted to Cuddapah to support the Gingee army from the rear. With the arrival of Kāsim Khān, the new faujdār of Conjeevaram at Wandiwash, the Mughal line of communication to the Emperor's court was secured from interruption for the time being.

When the Wazir, Asad Khān, proceeded with the Prince to the imperial court at Galgala, he was stopped on his way at Sāgar and the Prince alone reached his father's camp. Sir J. N. Sarkar believes that the stopping of the Wazir on the way was done by the Emperor, as a mark of his displeasure at his conduct. According to the account of Bhimsen, the Emperor fined Asad Khān, a huge sum as the price of the Prince's stores which had been looted and abandoned at Gingee and for which the old Wazir was held responsible.

A letter from Fort St. George, dated 22nd June 1693, refers to the displeasure of the Emperor with the Wazir. It says:—"Grand Wazir Asad Khān has not arrived with Zūlfikar

Khān. We do not yet know whether he is called away from Gingee in displeasure, of which there are various reports." Another letter from Fort St. George, dated 14th September, has also referred to the above fact. "We should not be mistaken in one concerning Asad Khān, the Grand Wazir, who, by reason of his son's failure in the conquest of Gingee, and the unkind usage of Prince Kambaksh, was recalled by the Mughal many months ago, but not yet admitted into the King's presence." Asad Khān seems to have been permitted to meet the Emperor, only after the lapse of a number of months, in the beginning of 1694, when he was forgiven; and the Emperor approved of the verse,—“Forgiveness has a sweet taste which retaliation lacks”—which was given expression to by a courtier standing nearby.

A letter (No. 33 of 1694) from Fort St. George has referred to the restoration of Asad Khān to the King's favour and also to the differences that existed between Asad Khān and Kambaksh. We shall return to Kambaksh who went to the Emperor on 11th June 1693. He justified his conduct before the Emperor by charging Zūlfikar Khān with treachery and with a collusive prolongation of the siege for his own enrichment. According to Professor Sarkar, Aurangzib did not

take the charge of Khān Buksh seriously.” Though the reinforcement brought by Kāsim Khān enabled the reassertion of Mughal authority in the country, Zuḷfikar Khān’s retreat to Wandiwash was taken advantage of by the enemy who plundered and seized several forts, and intercepted the supplies to the Mughal camp. The petty zamindars gave plenty of trouble and worsened the situation by plundering the grain-caravans of the Banjaras. Of these chiefs, one of the most prominent was Yāchappa (or Yāchama) Nayak of the Vēlugōti family, whose ancestors had gained possession of Satghar fort and acquired from Golconda the command of the levies recruited in the neighbourhood.*

* Rājah Baṅgāru Yāchama Naidu Bahadur (1693 A. D.) was of the 22nd generation of the family and held sway over Mallūr and some of the neighbouring par-gānahs in the Chittoor district. He gave as free gift, or *agraharam*, a village, named Mahādēvamangalam, in the Tiruvannāmalai taluk of Gingee and also Maṇṇūr in the Vēṅkatagiri taluk of the Nellore district, renaming the latter as Kumāra Yāchaṣamudram in honour of his father. In 1682 he granted the village of Siddavaram near Vēṅkatagiri and named it Varadamambāpuram. He built a *mantapa* in the temple of Vijayarāghavaswāmi at Tiruppukḷḷi, near Musaravākam. He is credited with a victory at Lakkireddipalli over a chief who had rebelled against the Sultan of Golconda and got from the latter as reward, the titles of Rājah Bahadur and shash hazāri mānsab (command of 6,000 horse) and privileges of *sabji ambāri*, *goshpēsh* and the honours of *pañchamarātib*. He is also credited in the chronicles, with having

Zūlfikar Khān set out in February 1694 from Wandiwash to conquer the isolated rock-fort of Perumukkal,* 18 miles north of Pondicherry and 6 miles east of Tiṇdivanam; and the *akhbarat* (of 14th November 1694, quoted by Professor Sarkar) records that the Emperor received a report from Zūlfikar Khān that in the storming of this fort, one Azīz Khān distinguished himself. Then Zūlfikar Khān went to the coast to “gaze on the ocean for the first time,” and marched down towards Tanjore by way of Pondicherry and other factories, capturing many forts and skirting Cuddalore on the way. A letter from Fort St. George of the year 1694, has thus referred to the approach of Zūlfikar Khān near Fort St. David:—“With the approach of Zūlfikar Khān’s army to Tanjore from Gingee, their near approach to the bounds of Fort St. David

been highly esteemed by Aurangzib himself for his valour and was once thought of by that emperor for replacing Nawab Zūlfikar Khān himself. This last is held to be the motive of the Nawab for bringing about his death during the Mahānavami festival, at a time when all weapons were reserved for worship and could not be used for war or wear, by inviting the unarmed Rājā to his tent and treacherously murdering him therein, by causing the whole tent to fall on his head, while he himself had withdrawn outside on some plea.

For a genealogical account of the earlier chiefs—see N. Venkataramanayya’s *Vēlugōtīvārivāṃśavali* (1939)—Introduction.

* For a note on the fort, see above p. 31.

(near Cuddalore) gave them cause to stand upon their guard. The Governor and Council of Fort St. David sent Messrs. Haynes and Montague to compliment Zūlfikar Khān with presents which cost 600 to 700 pagodas, to him and his officers. They were received courteously by the Nawab who gave a *farman* to free them from trouble by his army." Another letter, dated 19th June 1664, also refers to the devastation caused by Zūlfikar Khān's march from Gingee to Tanjore; his army "passing through the country adjacent to Fort St. David, made so great a devastation that the English will not undertake to make any investment till the country is settled."

Yāchama Nayak acted for some time as the chief adviser of Rājarām at Gingee; but when he found himself thrown into the background by other military advisers like Dhānāji, he left the Marathas in a huff in March 1693, and sought to carve out a dominion for himself. And it was only after he had contrived to get possession of Satgarh and extended his power eastwards in the direction of Vellore and had actually come into hostilities with Rājarām, that he was cajoled by Zūlfikar Khān to go over to the Mughal side, and tempted with a bait of a six thousand rank *mansab* and a fief in the Carnatic which would fetch about three lakhs of *hun* per annum.

When Zūlfikar Khān reached Tanjore in March 1694, the Nayak of Trichinopoly who had joined the Mughals and had helped them with men and money now besought him to recover for him some districts and forts from the Raja of Tanjore (Shāhji II). Zūlfikar Khān helped him with the conquest of some forts from the Raja of Tanjore, who had to yield to the Mughal attacks. Shāhji submitted to the Mughal suzerainty, promised to obey the Emperor's orders like a faithful vassal and to desist from assisting his cousin, to pay a tribute of 30 lakhs of rupees and to cede the forts of Pālayamkōṭṭai (near Chidambaram) Kāttumaṇṇārgudi, Srīmuṣṇam, Tiṭṭagudi, Tirunāmanaḷḷur, Elavānasōre, Kaḷḷakurichi, Paṇḍalam, Śittāmur and other places, which had been mortgaged to him by Rāja Rām. Shāhji II made, in addition to the above, large gifts to Zūlfikar Khān and other officers.

Rāja Rām, who had mortgaged the fort of Pālayamkōṭṭai, (near Chidambaram) to Tanjore, sent three thousand horse and seized the fort himself, so that when Zūlfikar Khān's army approached before it, he was refused admission and had consequently to lay siege to it. After six days of trench warfare, Daḷpat Rao seized the fortified village (*pēṭṭah*) before the fort-gate, losing 150 of his Bundēla

followers in the action. The garrison then capitulated and escaped by a postern gate under cover of the night (23rd June 1694).

Then the Mughal army returned to its base at Wandiwash by way of Tiruvati near Panruti and made an attack on Gingee. But the Marathas had taken care to plant outposts in the Vēṭṭavalam forest through which provisions could enter the fort.

Zūlfikar Khān renewed the siege operations actively by the end of 1694, though the people in the country knew that it was a mere show intended to deceive the Emperor. His treasonable collusion with the Marathas was well-known in the land. Yāchama Nayak wrote a letter to the Mughal Emperor, exposing Zūlfikar Khān's treasonable collusion with the Marathas and his deliberate prolongation of the siege of Gingee with a view to seizing power for himself on the death of Aurangzib. The Nayak moreover offered that he himself would capture the fort in eight days with his own troops unaided. This letter to the Mughal Emperor was, however, intercepted by Asad Khān; and Zūlfikar Khān accused Yāchama Nayak of treason against the Mughal and had him killed. On the day of the Mahānavami feast, he went on some pretext to North Mallūr, the Rajah's capital, and knowing that on that day all weapons of war were reserved for

special worship, and were not therefore available for war or wear, he invited the Rajah to his own tent for a short interview. The latter of course went unarmed, and after a few minutes' conversation with him in the tent, the Nawab withdrew on some plea, leaving the guest inside. Soon the ropes were cut and the whole tent was instantly pulled down on the head of the Rajah inside, so as to cause him immediate death. His followers, being also unarmed, were of no avail in saving the Rajah.

When news of this treachery reached the Rajah's palace, a son of his by his first wife, Sarvagna Kumāra Yāchēndra and another son by the third wife, Kumāra Nāyana, and Rāma Rao, a Brahmin boy who was brought up in the palace, were all entrusted to the care of a servant-woman, Polu, to be safely handed over to their relations, Juppaḷi Varu, and some Brahmin house-holders, known as Paśupati Avaru and Divi Varu, living in distant parts; and the maid-servant was secretly despatched out of the palace with the three children and with a small sum of money to cover the expenses of the journey. The ladies in the harem, namely, the three wives of the Rajah, his two daughters by the first wife, and one other by the third, committed suicide, preferring death to falling into the hands of the heinous Nawab and being dishonoured The destruction

of the palace records consequent on the Nawab's occupying North Maḷlūr marks the end of any history of the previous members of the royal line the particular plot of ground where the tent treachery took place is even now known as Dēra Guṇṭa (tent-pit) and there are two temples with the images of the heroic women who thus sacrificed their lives."* Manucci has also given very 'horrible details' of the self-destruction of Yāchama Nayak's family. He writes that Zūḷfikar Khān had brought a false charge of treason against the Nayak and killed him, because he had written a letter to the Emperor himself, exposing the traitorous designs of the Khān and offering that he himself would bring about the capture of the fort in the incredibly short space of eight days.**

A Madras letter of 18th September 1694 (Diary and Consultation Book, 1694, page 99) refers to the advice received from Zūḷfikar Khān's camp that Arāsama Nayak (Yāchama Nayak?) had been seized and put in irons and that the siege of Gingee had been renewed. By the 22nd September 1694 (Madras Diary and Consultation Book, 1694, page 102) a letter from Zūḷfikar

* A. Jagannatha Sastri : 'A Family History of the Venkatagiri Rajas' (1922), p. 61.

** *Storia Do Mogor* : edited by W. Irvine, Vol. III, pp. 271—72.)

Khān confirmed the report of the capture of Arāsama Nayak (Yāchama Nayak) and added that he and his family had been slain by his order.

François Martin, the Governor of Pondicherry, who was in close and constant touch with the court at Gingee, had referred frequently in his *Memoirs* to the fact that Zulfikar Khān had come to a secret understanding with Rāja Rām during the course of the siege and was guilty of traitorous proceedings. Zulfikar Khān was evidently trying to placate the Marathas, with the object of carving out an independent principality for himself on the death of Aurangzib, when the country would be involved in civil wars that would follow inevitably among his sons and his own safety and prospects would be in jeopardy.*

* The *Memoirs* of François Martin, recently edited by Mon. A Martineau, ex-Governor of Pondicherry and published in 3 volumes (1933), give an account from a reliable contemporary, of the details of the politics and military operations of the Gingee country. They came to an end with 1694 when Martin, having had to leave Pondicherry on its capture by the Dutch, arrived at Chandernagore. As noticed, above, (see p. 219: note on Martin's *Memoirs*) they were supplemented by two big portions of his *Journal* covering the period, February 1701—January 1703. Martin was very positive that it was Zulfikar Khān and his father, Asad Khan, who spread the false rumour as to Aurangzib's death and the accession of Shah Alam to the throne. Believing this possibly, Yāchama Nayak wrote to the Captain More of Chennapatnam (Governor of Madras) (Diary and Consultation Book, 2nd January, 1693) about the Mughal's death and the succession of Shah Alam. The rumour was

fairly widespread. From Martin we also learn that Zūlfikar Khan went at the head of a corps of soldiers to the tent of Prince Kam Baksh to arrest him. The servants of the Prince tried to prevent the Khan's entrance and in the ensuing confusion, many were killed and wounded, the cords of the Prince's tent were cut and the Prince was arrested. To appease the troops who would murmur at such a hard action against their Emperor's son, it was given out that they had secured some letters of the Prince in treacherous correspondence with Raja Ram. Martin says that Zūlfikar Khan and Asad Khan had another motive also in arresting the Prince; it was to take advantage of the disorders that would arise on the rumour of the Emperor's death and the war of succession among the imperial sons, and that they wished to use Kam Baksh in the designs they had projected of getting power completely into their hands, by handing him over to one of his brothers whom they might favour.

Consequent on all this confusion and the Emperor's anger at the arrest of his son, the Marathas proclaimed their sovereignty over Haidarabadi Carnatic and the Cuddapah and Conjeevaram districts. Rajaram was greatly elated and demanded a heavy sum of money on loan from the English at Fort St. David.

After the Maratha victory at Dēsūr, Zūlfikar Khan sent his envoys to treat with Rajaram in return for 100,000 pieces of gold, provided the Mughals were given the liberty of retiring with all that they had in camp without hindrance. The Mughal army left on the 22nd and 23rd January 1693, escorted by a corps of Maratha cavalry right up to Wandiwash. Many articles of value had to be left behind, including the tents and carpets of Prince Kam Baksh.

According to Martin, this agreement was the result of a collusion between Raja Ram and the two Khans who aimed to establish themselves as sovereigns of the Carnatic with a body of Marathas drawn to their side. "This design was confirmed by the subsequent conduct of Zūlfikar Khan in helping Raja Ram in the many expeditions he made in the territories of Gingee, Tanjore and Madura and even furnishing him with means of subsistence." They had in view the kingdoms of Gol-

Zūlfikar Khān's deliberate prolongation of the siege-operations were also obvious to the Madras Council ; and the Diary of November 1696 recorded as follows:—" Zūlfikar Khān had been frequently ordered to take Gingee and it was in his power to do so and destroy the Marathas in the country. Instead he had joined counsel with them." Even Bhīmsen, the right-hand man of Dalpat Rao, frequently charged Zūlfikar Khān with treasonable neglect of duty. " If he had wished it, he could have captured the fort on the very day he reached Gingee. But it is the practice of generals to prolong operations for their own profit and ease. And again God alone knows what policy he adopted." It has been noted above that Manucci was also of the same view.

Zūlfikar Khān held a war council where he discussed the best method of taking Gingee before he renewed active operations by the end of 1694. In October 1694, he marched out of Wandiwash and encamped north of the

conda and the Carnatic ; and Rajaram was to have for his share the kingdom of Bijapur. Sāntāji and other Maratha leaders were angry with Raja Ram for having treated with the Mughals, with the advice of only one minister. Sāntāji was " later pacified with some presents ; the murmurs ceased ; but the spirit was ulcerated." Other commanders were also disgusted and Yāchama Nayak and others also retired, so that Rajaram was left barely with 1,500 men.

Chengam fort which the Marathas frequently raided and from which they carried away horses and other booty. The Mughals however were able to retaliate by plundering the surrounding country and carrying away both men and goods.

The Mughal camp was then torn by dissensions among Zūlfikar Khān and his officers, like Dāud Khān Panni and Dalpat Rao who were believed to have even planned to seize their master and send him in chains to the Emperor. Zūlfikar Khān was even believed to have sent ten camels laden with coin to Rāja Rām; but that the convoy was intercepted by Dāud Khān on the way. Another report charged the Marathas with having poisoned the wells of the country and thrown “milk-hedges” in some of the tanks and thus brought about the death of a number of people.

Zulfikar Khān however captured a few forts from the Marathas and vigorously renewed the siege operations on the receipt of three lakhs of rupees from the Mughal court. During this period there were many desertions from his army and the continuing scarcity of grain intensified the sufferings of the Mughals. The year 1695 was as uneventful and unprosperous to the Mughal arms as the previous ones had been.

By the end of 1695, came the alarming news of the approach of a large Maratha army under Sāṇtāji and Dānāji Jādhav. A letter from Fort St. David, dated 12th December 1695, advised the English at Madras that 12,000 Maratha horsemen had come to Gingee. Another letter from Fort St. David, dated 17th December 1695, gave the camp news of Dhānāji Jādhav's arrival with 6,000 horse at Gingee. These reinforcements to the Maratha forces had so much upset the Mughals that many took fright and fled to places like Madras for protection.

The increase of the Maratha forces at Gingee obliged Hatsell, the Governor of Fort St. David, to be friendly towards Rāja Rām whose position was greatly strengthened by the accession of Sāṇtāji and Dhānāji. The Madras Diary and Consultation Book of January 1696 thus recorded:—"The Marathas increasing at Gingee and frequently sending raiding parties into several parts of the country near Tegnapatam (Fort St. David) it was found necessary that Hatsell should accommodate the demands of Rāja Rām and his officers, as circumstances required. There ought to be a fair correspondence with the Marathas during the present uncertain state of things between them and the Mughals, the former appearing to be very powerful in the country, unless the

Mughal Emperor shall speedily send a considerable army to the help of Zūlfikar Khān."

The arrival of Sāntāji and Dhānāji * obliged Zūlfikar Khān to concentrate all his forces in order to protect himself against a possible attack. Throughout the year 1696, he was hampered by extreme want of money. He vainly begged the English merchants of Madras for a loan of one lakh of *hun*, for which he offered to mortgage to them any part of the country. Sometime later, in a moment of desperation, he sent out to them a threat of open attack on them.**

* Sāntāji had previously quarrelled with Dhānāji and had departed in dudgeon for Mahārāshtra even in 1693. Thereupon Dhānāji had been appointed the Sēnāpati of the Maratha army in the Gingee country. On their way, the advancing Marathas had crushed Kāsim Khān, the Mughal governor of Sera and the Mysore Balaghat country.

** In 1693 Nawab Asad Khān, the Wazir, granted a *parwana* for three villages in the neighbourhood of Madras, for which an application had been made in the previous year by Governor Yale. Meanwhile, two of the three villages granted were claimed by one Vēlāyuda Arasama Nayak as having been included in a jaghir granted to him by Nawab Zūlfikar Khān. On a representation by the English Governor, Zūlfikar Khān had to give a fresh grant of these villages in dispute in order to supersede his gift to Arasama Nayak. In February 1694, President Higginson of the Madras Council thus wrote to Asad Khān, the Grand Vizier:—"Since the King's beginning to reign it is now 37 years. I have often acquainted your Excellency of the many services done to His Majesty and his servants in Ascar Cāwn and Allemerdecāwn's (Ascar Cāwn and Allemerdecāwn 'Ali

Asghar Khān' and 'Ali Mardan Khān,' successive Nawabs of the Carnatic—P.C., vol. xvi., 24th August and 1st September, 1690. The latter, on being taken a prisoner at Gingee by the Marathas, was succeeded by Kasim Khan—P.C., vol. xix, 25th February, 1693) time. You cannot chuse but be sensible of it; besides the provision wee have allways sent up, and still continueing the same, to your Camp att Ghingee and Wandewash. Upon which your Excellency gott from Prince Cawn Bux his Neshawn for us for three towns, which was given as a free gift, together with your own Seal and Perwanna for the same. Besides which, your Excellency have often promised in your letters that you would get the King's Phirmaund for us at the King's Camp to send it us presently."

In 1693, Dr. Samuel Brown proceeded from Madras to Gingee in order to get from Kāsim Khān, the Nawab-designate of the Carnatic, a *parwana* for six villages on the northern side of Madras. In July 1695, the Council sent a message through Nārāyanan, their Indian agent, requesting from Zūlfikar Khan the grant of the village of Vepery, now an integral part of the city of Madras, which was then wedged in between the three villages granted in 1693.

In order to make clear the sequence of English transactions with the country powers, regarding their acquisition of new territories, the following extract from the original records of Fort St. George, namely, the *account* of Edward Harrison, then Governor of Madras, despatched, in October 1711, to the President and Council of Fort William in Bengal is given. The account traces, so far as could be obtained from the records then preserved at Madras, the genesis of the first settlement at Fort St. George "with the Severall Priviledges granted us From Time to time att this and other Places upon the Coast of Choromandell."

Extracts

'We remained in Peaceable possession of our Priviledges till the Mogull came into these parts to the Conquest of Golconda and Visapore, when Mr. Elihu Yale and his Councill thought it necessary to send an Armenian, One Ovannes, to Reside in the Mogulls Camp as their Vakeel to treat for a Phirmaund, which was in the

Year 1688. The Vakeel wrote word that he had brought matters very near to a Conclusion; when, at the same time, Letters were sent from the Camp that Generall Child (Sir John Child, 'Generall of India') at Bombay had made a Peace with the Moores (Peace was proclaimed in 1698), and was to have a generall Phirmaund from the Mogull, in which this Place and Bengall were to be included. Which put a Stop to what Governour Yale was then doing, And the Vakeel was ordered to distribute no more mony till further orders. All that we can find of this Phirmaund upon our Books is a very slight Paper Containing nothing materiall to the Purpose.

'The next Steps that were made towards getting a Phirmaund were in the Year 1692 by Mr. Yale, when Cawn Bux, Assid Cawn and Zulphakur Cawn were at Chingee, when Messrs Trenchfield and Pitt (Richard Trenchfield and John Pitt) were sent from this Place to wait upon them with a Considerable Present. Upon which they obtained liberty for our Mint, with a Nashawn from the Prince, a Phirwana and Dustuck from Assid Cawn, of which we send you Copys; and you may observe that a Phirmaund is therein promised, but has never been complied with.

'Another Essay was made in Mr. Higginson's time, Agno 1695—(Meanwhile, on the 10th February, 1693, Asad Khan had granted the villages of Egmore, Pursawaukum and Tandore—to procure a Phirmaund when Zulphacer Cawn was with a Camp in these parts employed in the Conquest of Ellore; (Apparently Vellore is meant.—Cf. P. to Eng., vol. i, 6th June, 1695); but all that Mr. Higginson could procure was Parwannas to Confirm our Priviledges According to Sallabad. And so this matter has rested from that time to this, and we have been pretty easie; only upon Alterations of Government the Great Men have been always troublesome and exacting of Mony. We have now given you a full account (of all) that has ever been done for Securing our Priviledges in this Settlement.

'Fort St. David and Cuddalore was granted us in 1688 (they were acquired in 1690) by Ram Raz, Raja of Chingee; and when Zulphakur Cawn Conquered that City he was pleased to Confirm the grant of that and the depending Villages.

In April 1696, Sāntāji was defeated near Ārṇi by Zuḷfīkar Khān who had to confine himself to the defence of Arcot on the death of one of his chief officers, Rāja Kishōre Siṅgh Hada. Sāntāji however marched towards Cuddapah where he intercepted the treasure despatched by the Emperor to Zūḷfīkar Khān who however set out for him. Sāntāji changed his plan and Zūḷfīkar Khān had to fall back on Arcot towards the close of December 1696. Sānta was pursued into central Mysore where Zuḷfīkar Khān was enabled to gain strength from the army of Prince Bider Bakht who had been despatched by the Emperor and advanced to Pēnukōṇḍa.

The financial difficulties of Zuḷfīkar Khān being as great as ever, he had to go south to exact tributes from Tanjore and other places in the south. He spent all his treasure in a very short time; and he could not pay off the arrears due to the troops. He returned to Wandiwash by way of Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and Tirukōvilūr and found that the Marathas had some internal dissensions which greatly tended to weaken them. Such dissensions among the Marathas had been manifest from time to time in Gingee. The present one was a bitter and final rupture between the two Maratha commanders, Sāntāji and Dhānāji, who violently quarrelled for the post of com-

mander-in-chief. Rāma Rāja himself sided with Dhānāji; but the latter was finally foiled in his endeavour and forced to retire to Mahārāshtra. The account of Bhimsen is very frank about the condition of affairs in the Maratha court. Among their leaders not much union was seen. Everyone called himself a sardar and went out to plunder on his own account.*

Rāja Rām also was in as great need of money as the Mughals were; and hence he entreated peace on certain conditions and sent his own illegitimate son, Karna, “through the mediation of Rāma Singh Hada”, to Zūlfikar Khān, who was requested to forward his petition to the Mughal. Aurangzib would not listen to Rāja Rām’s offer of submission and ordered Zūlfikar

* “Dhunnah having disagreed with Suntah, represented to Rama that this chief had usurped dangerous power, from his large army, and had formed plans of treason against him. Upon this Rama dispatched Amreet Raow, a chief of much reputation, with his own and Dunnah’s troops, to attack Suntah who defeated them. Rama and Dhunnah retreated to Jinjee and Suntah returned to his own country, much displeased at their treatment; but he was killed in a surprise shortly after, by the brother-in-law of Amreet Raow, who cut off his head, and sent it to the emperor. Dhunnah now acquired great power among the Marathas and formed a party with Ram Chund Pandit, Rama’s minister; but Perseram another principal Pundit, favoured the cause of Ranoo, Suntah’s son and his uncle, Herjee Hindoo Raow.”

(Ferishta’s *History of the Dekkan* by Jonathan Scott—Vol. II (Part III—Aurungzebe’s Operations in Dekkan)—p. 96—(ed. 1794).

Khān to renew the siege operations vigorously and “capture Gingee without further delay.” Zūlfikar Khān sent back Kārna to his father in the middle of October and, early in November 1697, renewed the attack of Gingee in right earnest.

“A spy Brahmin from the camp advised that the Nawab hath sent Rāmarāja’s son to Gingee and hath sent him word that the Mughal doth not approve of his proposals and hath ordered him to take Gingee in a few days.”*

Zūlfikar Khān took up his post opposite the northern gate towards the Singavaram hill. Rām Singh Hada was posted on the western side of the fort, opposite Shaitan Dari (Port-du-Diable) while Dāud Khān Panni was posted before Chaḡkili Drug, a little to the south. Dāud Khān Panni was able to capture Chaḡkili Drug in the compass of a single day by “a reckless assault at close quarters,” though he had insufficient siege materials. After this victory he advanced his troops and took up a position nearer the main fort, opposite Chandrāyandrug, the southern fort. The

* (Madras Diary and Consultation Book, 1697, page 128.) The emperor ordered Zūlfikar Khan to commence the siege operations in right earnest. The Khan was honoured by the title of Nasrat Jang, upon which he gave a great feast and conferred rich presents upon his officers and troops. This was when he was encamped for the rains at Wandiwash.

siege was dragged on for two months more and frequent reports were despatched to the imperial camp of almost daily attacks and repulses. In the picturesque words of Sir J. N. Sarkar:—"If Zūlfīqar had wished it, he could have taken the entire fort the next day. But his secret policy was to prolong the siege in order to keep his army together, enjoy his emoluments, and escape the hardships of active duty on some new expedition. He let the Marathas know that his attacks were for show only, and that he would give Rājarām sufficient notice to escape before he captured the fort Dāud Khān, second in command of the Mughal army, drank largely of the best European liquors, and, when full of the god of wine, would perpetually volunteer the extirpation of the infidels. Zūlfīqar necessarily assented to these enterprises, but always gave secret intelligence to the enemy of the time and place of attack; and the troops of Dāud Khan were as often repulsed with slaughter."*

Bhīmsen, the chief source of our information regarding the siege operations and possessing an authenticity for "many incidents of the Mughal warfare in the Deccan, as valuable as the reports of the 'Eye-witness' in the present (1914-18) European war," and

* (Sir J. N. Sarkar: 'History of Aurangzib', Vol. V, page 106).

being "the only source of detailed information about them," tells us very definitely that Zūlfikar Khān was in collusion with the Marathas and sent information to them regarding every projected attack of the Mughals. The *History* of Nārāyanan to which reference has been made earlier in our narrative and which was compiled in A. D. 1802-3, supports the view that Zūlfikar Khān pretended vigorous operations in the course of fasli 1106 (1696-97), "in the belief that, if the Pādushāh (Emperor) had no trouble in Hindustan, the Dakhan or the Karnatak, the sepoys would have no work." But when Aurangzib sent money and reinforcements under the command of Dāūd Khan, Muhammad Śyed Kevud, Vēṅkatapathi and others, the siege of Gingee was pushed on vigorously and Rājarām considered that it was no longer safe to remain in Gingee; and this would imply that collusion stopped about this time. Sir J.N. Sarkar says that at last it became necessary for the Khān to capture the fort "if he wished to avoid disgrace and punishment by his master." But Rājarām, we read, received a timely warning and contrived to escape by the west gate to Vellore along with his chief officers, though he had to leave his family and followers, numbering several thousands, behind. "The total ruin of Mahārāshtra power might have been effected with ease many years before; had it not been for the generals who

delayed on purpose and secretly assisted each other to draw out the war to a never-ending length for their own advantage.”

Zūlfikar Khān could not any longer protract the siege, if he was to avoid disgrace and punishment at the hands of the Emperor. The letter from Fort St. George dated March 1698 says “that four or five thousand Marathas came to Vellore where Rāma Rāja had escaped from Gingee, which obliged the Nawab to pursue him.”

Then Zūlfikar Khān gave the order for an assault. While Dāud Khan was engaged in scaling Chandrāyan Drug from the south, Dalpat Rao scaled the north wall of Kṛṣṇagiri and captured the outer fort after a severe struggle. The garrison then retreated to an inner fort called Kaḷakōt, into which Dalpat Rao and his Bundēlas entered pell-mell after killing many. Many Marathas were put to death and the survivors took refuge in Rājagiri, the highest fort. Dāud Khan had made his way into Chandrāyandrug and advanced towards Kṛṣṇagiri. The inhabitants to the top of Kṛṣṇagiri had to capitulate. A vast amount of booty in horses, camels and other things fell into the hands of the Imperialists.

Rāja Rām's family was then invested in Rājagiri, the highest and the strongest of forts

of Gingee. Dālpāt Rao held the gate of Kaḷakōt. Zūlfikar Khān, who had entered by opening Shaitan Dari (the Portu-du-Diable of Orme,) secured the entrance to Rājagiri by crossing the chasm at its foot by means of a wooden bridge. The Maratha royal family begged for safety; and Zūlfikar Khān gave them assurances of protection and good treatment through Rama Chand Hada. Palanquins were sent to the women and children of the family of Rāja Rām, who came out of the citadel and were saved from violence. They were also kept in honourable captivity. One of Rāja Rām's wives avoided the disgrace of a surrender by throwing herself from the summit of the fort into the depths below. Her head was dashed to pieces as it struck a projecting rock. Her mangled corpse remained in an inaccessible place without a funeral. About four thousand women and children were found in the fort; but there were only very few fighting men among them. *

In this connection the version of Nārāyanan of Rāja Rām's escape and of the capture of the fort by Zūlfikar Khān can be compared with the above narrative with advantage. "While this was the condition of affairs in camp, there arrived from the Pādushā to the Nawab money and reinforcements

* Scott: *History of the Dekkan*, Vol. II, p. 98.

under the command of Nawab Dāūd Khān, Muhammad Śyed Kevud, Vēṅkatapati and others. On the arrival of these, the siege of Gingee was pushed on vigorously. Rājarām considered it was no more safe to remain in Gingee. Taking with him, from among the Mēlachēri Killēdhārs, Kaṇḍē Rao and others with all valuables and taking with him his wives and attendants, he was getting ready to quit the fort. The Nawab was not aware of this. He actually thought that, as the siege had been going on for twelve years, and as even the Pādushā's resources were getting almost exhausted, the fortress was actually going to fall. He therefore ordered that the siege might be pressed and efforts made to take it without further delay. Nawab Dāūd Khān and his contingent attacked Chandra-drug. Kevud and his contingent similarly attacked Kriṣhnagiri, while the Nawab (Amīr-ul-Umāra) with all the remaining forces sat down in front of the principal entrance to the fortress. At this stage of the siege, Rājarām opened the Tiruvaṇṇāmalai gate and, with all his impedimenta, got out of the fort and set forward, marching westwards. The army of the Nawab, however, continued the siege; and the fort fell in the year of Fasli, 1107, the year *Iswara*, month *Thai*, day 2 (Saturday 31st December 1697). The fortress gate by which the

Nawab entered was called Fatēh Darwaja (victory gate). Hearing that the enemy had escaped, the Nawab's army fought its way successfully and arrived at Peṇṇāṭṭur. Attacked again there, they reached Tiruvaṇṇāmalai the next day, and breaking camp again there, the army of Rājarām marched through the pass of Cheṅgama to Tiruppattur, thence to Kōlar and ultimately reached Poona. The Nawab's army pursued them, till they passed the ghats and returned."

Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar writes thus of the manner in which Rāja Rām made his escape :—" The account of Nārāyana Pillai here is that all the while the Nawab was feigning an attack, and whenever it was proposed to make an attack, Rājarām had previous intimation. It is difficult to believe that Rājarām had no intimation of it. Whether Zulfikar Khān gave intimation or no, Rājarām apparently had intimation of what was taking place in the Nawab's camp and planned his retreat accordingly. He seems to have taken a somewhat sequestered way out of the fort with all his family and entourage, and got out of the fort in the night safely, unknown to the besiegers. From various references in the records of Fort St. George, he loitered about the Karnatak and remained in Vellore till a contingent of 3,000 Mahratta horse came from

Poona and took him safely from Vellore in the month of March following.”*

Zūlfikār Khan then supervised the collection and safe storage of the property and the war materials found in the fort. Many Maratha officers were put to death. He gave orders for the repair of the fort and made Kakar Khan the *killēdar* of the fort. Gazan-

* *Journal of Indian History*; Vol. IX, 1930, pp. 5—6.

Letters from Fort St. George, 1698 :—Letter, dated 4th March.—‘But it hath happened in this juncture 4 or 5,000 Morattas came to Vellore, whither Ramaraja had escaped from Chingee which obliged the Nabob to carry his Army thither. Ramraja upon that news is gone from Vellore with the said Morattas, and the Nabob follows them, but probably no further than the extent of his Country, and his returne is expected suddainly after which itt will appear whether he do’s really design to trouble us. Att present wee can make no judgment having yet received no answer to the Letters sent him so that wee find reason to confirme the caution given you in the enclosed, and the rather because the last letters received from Fort St. David yesterday give an account of their advices, that Seilim Cawn doth threaten and prepair for another assault of Cuddallor.’

Letters from Fort St. George, 1698 :—Letter, dated 8th March.—‘Spye Branines from the camp advise that the Nabob hath followed after Ramraja as far as Gurru (c) unda and that from thence the Nabob will returne to Sautgur and from thence to Arcott to keep the Ramzan, Amērjeahan is gone with the Camp, but there is no Letter from him since he sett out from Wandevas, so soon as wee heare anything from him shall communicate itt to you.’

Letters from Fort St. George, 1698 :—Letter dated 28th March.—‘Last night our peons came from the camp who advise that the camp was 8 days agoe beyond Gur-rungunda, and that the Nabob designed to go (after he had finished some business with Polligars) against Vellore.’

far Khān (the Cussafur Khan of the Fort St. George Records) was appointed the *fāujdār* of the district, while Dāud Khān Panni was raised to be the *fāujdār* of the Carnatic, “in accordance with the orders of the imperial head-quarters in the year of fasli 1108 (A. D. 1698)”. Muhammad Śayyad Khān was raised to be the *diwan*, Lālā Daḥni Rāy appointed as the *diwan-pēshkar*, and Lālā Tōdar Māl was made the *sheristadār* of the Carnatic. Gingee itself was renamed Nasratgādh by Zuḥfīkar Khān, probably in commemoration of his new title, Nasrat Jang.

Khāfi Khan, the author of *Muntakhabu-i-Lubab*, says cryptically that a sum of money reached the enemy who then evacuated the fort and retired. This view implies the surrender of the fort through bribery. A full account of the operations connected with the siege of Gingee is given below, as taken from the translation of the work by Sir H. M. Elliot and Professor John Dowson.*

“It was impossible to invest all the forts, but the lines were allotted to different commanders, and every exertion was made for digging mines and erecting batteries . . . The garrison also did their best to put the place in order, and make a stout defence. From time

* Vol. VII, *History of India as told by its own Historians*—pp. 348-9.

to time they fired a gun or two. The *zamin-dars*, far and near, of the country round, and the Mahratta forces, surrounded the royal army on all sides, and showed great audacity in cutting off supplies. Sometimes they burst unexpectedly into an intrenchment, doing great damage to the works, and causing great confusion in the besieging force. . . .”

“The siege had gone on for a long time, and many men fell ; but although the enemy’s relieving force day by day increased, Zūlfikār Khān Nusrat Jang and the other generals so pressed the siege that it went hard with the garrison. The command of the army and general management of civil and revenue affairs in that part of the country were in the hands of Jamdatu-l Mulk and Nusrat Jang. This gave great offence to Prince Muhammad Kām Bakhsh, and Jamdatu-l Mulk and Nusrat Jang had to admonish him, and speak to him sharply about some youthful follies. The Prince was greatly offended. The Prince wished that the siege should be carried on in his name ; but the generals acted on their own authority. Day by day the dissensions increased. The besieged were aware of these differences, and contrived to open communications with the Prince, and to fan the flames of his discontent, so that great danger threatened the army.”

“Intelligence now came of the approach of Santā; and the enemy’s forces so closed round the royal army and shut up the roads, that for some days there were no communications whatever between the army and His Majesty. Messages still came to the Prince from the garrison, exciting his apprehensions, and holding out allurements. He was vexed with Jamdatu-l Mulk’s opposition, and no communications arrived from the Emperor; so he was on the point of going over to the enemy. Jamdatu-l Mulk and Nusrat Jang were informed of this, and they surrounded his tents, and made the Prince prisoner.”

“When these troubles and discords were at their height, Santā came down upon the royal army with twenty-five thousand horse, and reduced it to such straits that the commanders deemed it expedient to leave their baggage and some of their *matériel* to be plundered by Santā, and to retire into the hills for refuge. Every one was to carry off what he could, and the idea was that Santā would stop to plunder what was left, and not follow the retreating force. Accordingly, the two generals retired fighting for some *kos*, till they reached the shelter of the hills, when they beat off Santā. A few days afterwards they renewed the siege, and the garrison was hard pressed. According to report, a sum of

money reached the enemy, and they evacuated the fortress and retired.”

“When intelligence of the arrest of Prince Muhammad Kam Bakhsh reached Aurangzeb, he apparently acquiesced in it as a matter of necessity. The news of the reduction of the fortress came soon afterwards, and he applauded the services performed by the two generals. In reality, he was offended, and summoned the Prince with the two generals to his presence. The Prince was brought up under arrest. After waiting upon Aurangzeb, he addressed a few words of admonition to Jamdatu-l Mulk ; but afterwards the marks of his displeasure became more apparent. Orders were given to set the Prince at liberty.” *

The following account of Zūlfikar Khān's part in the capture of Gingee will bring to light the cruelty which probably attended the capture of the fort. “The heads of enemies turned giddy. The pregnancy of women came to a premature end. Round Gingee the Mughals came with great energy, like the eight elephants round the chief mountain, and pitched their tents and planted their flags.

* This notice of the long-drawn siege of operations round Gingee foreshortens the time spent between the arrest of Kam Bakhsh and the final Mughal acquisition of the fortress ; but it confirms the dubious manner in which the Marathas were forced out of the fortress.

The crowds of fierce elephants surrounded the place like rows of black hills. Bushes and trees were lopped off; the forests were cut down and horses that carried baggages were tethered in many rows. The Mughals placed patrols in eight directions to guard against thieves."

"Fearing that the Tulushkas might take them captives, the Marathas no more desiring to rule, ran away from their homes. They did not mind their cattle and children. Some carried on their hips dearly loved babies. Others, fond of their wealth, concealed themselves nearby. Others deserted their children weeping. Like the birds that wander in the sky, many took refuge in the forest. Many others suffered from hunger. All the people in great distress left their homes."

The Date of the Capture of Gingee

Seven years had to pass before Gingee could be finally captured by the Mughals under Zūlfikār Khān.

Sir Jadunath Sarkar has left the question of the date of the fall of the fortress open. Thus he gives a note on the dates embodied in his sources of information:—"M.A. 391 explicitly says that Jinji was captured on 6th Shaban, 41st of Aurangzib (=7th Feb. 1698).

The Madras Diary of 2nd January 1698 records: 'A letter from Amir Jahan from the Mughal camp received to-day advises that the Nawab has taken the Jinji forts all but one which also offers to capitulate.' If we read Rajab instead of Shaban in M. A., we get 8th January. Bhīmsen (135a) says that the fort fell on a *San̄krānti*, which would give 2nd or 31st January. Chit̄nis (ii. 58), as usual is grossly incorrect, giving *Chaitra pratipad Sudi* 1618 = 23rd March 1696, as the date of the capture." *

Sir J. N. Sarkar has quoted the *Maasir-i-Ālamgīri*, which says that Gingee was captured on 6th Shahban, 41st year of Aurangzib (7th February 1698). This date cannot be accepted in the light of contemporary Madras records which refer to the capture of Gingee even early in January 1698. Scott** has given the date 1700 A.D. (A.H. 1112) for the capture of the fort. According to Bhīmsen, the agent of Dalpat Rao Bundela, whose account has been an invaluable contemporary source, being the testimony of an eye-witness, the fort fell on a *San̄krānti* day, which is equated to either 2nd January 1698 or 31st January 1698, as either of the dates marks the entry of the Sun into one of the signs of

* J. Sarkar: 'History of Aurangzib' Vol. V, p. 108, foot-note.

** History of the Deccan, Vol. II.

Zodiac, such entry being termed the *sank-rānti*. Sarkar has also quoted the authority of the Diary and Consultation Book of Fort St. George, where there is an entry dated 2nd January (O.S. 1698) or 12th January (N.S. 1698), which says that information had been received that all but one of the fortresses of Gingee had fallen to Zūlfikar Khān. It records a letter received from Amīr Jahān from the Mughal camp which says, "that the Nawab had taken all the forts except one which also doth offer to capitulate." (*Diary and Consultation Book, 1697, p. 152*).

The History of the Karnataka Governors, in the Mackenzie Mss., gives the *fasli* year 1107, Iswara, in the month of *Thai* (2nd day) equivalent to Friday, 31st December 1697. A letter from Fort St. George of 28th December 1697, contained a report "that Zūlfikar Khān has set up his flag on one of the hills of Gingee and makes a show of taking the place." (*Letters from Fort St. George, 1697, page 34*). As the three hills were strongly fortified, it was very likely that they could not be captured all at one stroke and there were probably intervals of some days before all of them could be captured.

The date given by Bhīmsen (which has been equated to 2nd or 31st January 1698) can be taken to be approximately the same as that

of the manuscript. “The manuscript gives the 2nd day of *Thai* for the capture of the fort. The first of *Thai* is generally celebrated in South India as *San̄krānti*. Bhīmsen’s reference to *San̄krānti* which was most likely based on what he heard from the country people as the *San̄krānti* day, is not probably the monthly entry of the sun into the Zodiac, but the special *San̄krānti* which came annually about the end of December in English Old Style dates, till September 3rd, 1752 when the calendar was added to by eleven days, in order to correspond with the computations made by Roman Catholic countries from October 5th, 1582, when they adopted the New Style of reckoning.*

* Thus English dates between September 3, 1752 and 1699 should be advanced by 11 days, and by 10 days from 1582 to 1699, if those should be equated on the basis of the present calendar. 30th December, 1697 (O.S.) will be equivalent to 9th January 1698, according to the current reckoning. Thus the cyclic solar year, *Āṅgīrasa*, which according to O.S. English reckoning, commenced from the 29th March 1752, ended only on the 9th April 1753—i.e., 9th April, according to New Style—eleven days having been added to the reckoning from September 3rd 1752, reckoned as 14th September. (See *South Indian Chronological Tables* by W. S. Krishnaswami Naidu, edited by R. Sewell (1894)—pp. 68 and 70.)

Isvara (Kali) 4799, *Saka* 1620, began on the 29 March 1697 (O.S.) and ended on the 28th March 1698 (O.S.). *Hijra* 1109 began on July 10, 1697 and ended on June 29, 1698 (O.S.). Pope Gregory’s reform of the Calendar in 1582, corrected the dates by omitting ten days and making change in the reckoning of leap years. In the Julian Calendar every fourth year was a leap year; but in the

In that year it was perhaps on the 30th of December. On the 31st also, according to popular usage, the celebration of *Pongal* continued and Bhimsen might have so heard it.

The Madras Diary of 2nd January 1698 stated that one of the hills had been captured before that date. A congratulatory letter was then decided to be sent to the Mughal camp. "Mr. Empson was ordered to procure the most proper rarities to the amount not exceeding 300 pagodas to be sent to the Nawab with a congratulatory letter." (*Diary and Consultation Book*. 1697, page 152). By 17th January 1698 (*Diary and Consultation Book* 1698, page 4) a letter was received from Amīr Jahān which stated that the Nawab received gladly the whole present sent to him in congratulation of the conquest of Gingee." Another entry dated 11th January 1698 (*Letters to Fort St. George*, page 6) says "that Zulfikar Khān had taken Gingee and become absolute

Gregorian Calendar century years are not leap years, unless their first two figures are divisible by four. Thus 1600 was a leap year and 2000 will be a leap year; but 1700, 1800 and 1900 are not leap years.

As the Gregorian Calendar was adopted in England in 1752 (suppressing 11 days between September 2 and 14) 10 days must be added to English dates from 1583 to 1699 inclusive and 11 days from that year to September 2, 1752.

(*Vide Comparative Tables of Muhammadan and Christian Dates*—Compiled by Lt. Col. Sir Wolseley Haig—1932—pp. 5—6).

master of the country and also warned the Fort St. David authorities to be very careful and be prepared for an attack." This letter was written on 5th January. Hence Gingee should have been completely captured between the 28th December 1697 and 5th January 1698.

A letter to the Agent and Council, dated 26th February 1698, stated that, in the last month, *i.e.*, (January), Zūlfikār Khān took Gingee, Rāja Rām having escaped by the Nawab's contrivance to Vellore fort where he was then halting and appointed Gussafar Khān, to be the *killēdar* of Gingee, and gave him Cuddalore and Tegnapatam as part of his jāghir.

This letter also refers to January 1698 as the time of the fall of Gingee. On the basis of the Fort St. George records, we can definitely say that Gingee had completely fallen into the hands of Zūlfikār Khān in the first week of 1698. According to the Minutes and Consultations of April 1698 (page 35), Zūlfikār Khān's *mansab* was increased by 1,000 horse, along with a *teshariff* of elephants, horses, and swords after his conquest of Gingee. The place (Gingee) was renamed Nasratgaddah (city of victory) in honour of Zūlfikār Khān who had the title Nasrat Jang. Gussafar Khān was then the *killēdar* of Gingee.

After the capture of Gingee, the place lost to a considerable extent its importance as the key to the control of the lower Carnatic region. It was placed in charge of a *killēdar*, who, as we have seen, was subject to the authority of the *faujdār* at Arcot. Zūlfikār Khān appointed Gazanfar (Gussafar) Khān to be the *killēdar* of the fort and gave him as part of his *jāghir*, the towns of Cuddalore and Tegna-patam. He sent also a *farman* to President Hatsell of the Fort St. David Council, demanding the delivery of these towns to Gussafar Khān's people. Hatsell seems to have refused his demand which resulted in the attacks of Śalīm Khān, the brother of Dāūd Khān Panni, who had played a great part in the capture of Gingee.

Śalīm Khān, under a pretence of lodging the King's treasure in Cuddalore for a night, made a surprise attack on the place with fifty men. However, a party of fifty English soldiers was able to force him to retreat. "Śalīm Khān's letter to the Governor of Fort St. David desiring that nine ox-loads of the King's treasure might remain at Cuddalore for security, which being brought in by horsemen, seized the Porto Novo gate, wounding a corporal, seized Chidambaram, robbed the bazaar and carried away three elephants. The Moors were, however, beaten out of the town with the loss

of eight men killed and five taken prisoners with a few horses.”

An attempt was made by the English at Madras to conciliate Śalīm Khān by a payment of money in return for a *farman* confirming the rights of the Company to Dēvanāmpatnam and Cuddalore. Śalīm Khān demanded more than what they offered and again threatened Cuddalore and burnt some of the villages of Fort St. David. A letter from Fort St. David advises a second engagement with Śalīm Khān and his men, wherein they were repelled, though they burnt several towns within our bounds. (*Minutes and Consultation Book*, 31st January 1698, page 9). From a letter of 25th March 1698 to Vizagapatam, we learn that Śalīm Khān came very near Cuddalore, planned a third attack, but however returned without making any attempt.” (*Letters from Fort St. George*, 1698, page 22).

Later, Dāūd Khān, one of Zūlfikār Khān's generals before Gingee and a notorious drunkard, was appointed to the governorship of the Carnatic. He frequently tried to extort money from the Madras Agency and invested Fort St. George, which lasted for three months. Egmore, Purasavakkam and Triplicane were plundered by him. He repeated this action several times. Every time the blockade was

abandoned by him after he was appeased by liquors and presents.

Gussafar Khān (the *killēdar* of Gingee from January to May 1698) left the place for another appointment by the end of May. In April he renewed the demand for the towns of Tegnapatam and Cuddalore, as he had to render an account to Kākar Khan his successor. The letter from President Higginson to Vizagapatam, dated 16th June 1698, says:—"Gassafar Khān who was the Governor of Gingee fort since its conquest, is by the King's order appointed Nawab of 'Cateck' and he went with 200 horse and 400 foot." (*Letters from Fort St. George 1698*, page 74). A letter from Gussafar Khān, dated 23rd April 1698, renewed the demand of the towns of Tegnapatam and Cuddalore as he has to render account to Kākar Khān on his quitting Gingee." (*Letters from Fort St. George 1698*, page 48).

From June to November 1698, Kākar Khān was the *killēdar* of Gingee and he seems to have died by the beginning of November 1698 for "We had advise from the camp that Kākar Khān is dead and that another is sent to succeed him." (*Letters from Fort St. George*, 7th November 1698, page 125).

CHAPTER VIII

Gingee under the Mughals The Period of Bundēla rule

- | | | |
|----------------------|-----|----------------------------------|
| (1) Rāja Sarūp Singh | ... | 1700—1714 |
| (2) Rāja Dēsing | ... | January 1714 to
October 1714. |

We have seen in the previous chapter how the Mughals was able to capture the fort of Gingee in the Carnatic from Rāmarāja, King of the Marathas, early in 1698 or in the last days of 1697, after a protracted and weak siege of seven years. Zūḷfikār Khān, the son of Asad Khān, the Grand Vizier, was in command of the siege operations of Gingee and of its government till he left the Carnatic after about a year from its fall.

According to the Fort St. David correspondence for 1698, it is clear that throughout 1698, Zūḷfikār Khān was busy in the restoration of order in the neighbouring country. He marched into the Tanjore country and encamped at Tiruvaīyār where he secured the submission of Ekōji Bhōnslé, whose *vakil* submitted *nazar* and contributions for the expenses of the troops and promised to pay a regular tribute. Similar claims were successfully enforced, for the time being, over the Nayak ruler of Trichinopoly and the Marava poligars

of Rāṁnad and Sivagaṅga. He also installed Kumāra Yāchama Nayaka in his father's place and gave him a suitable *mansab* and *jaghir* and gave Shivanāth Singh, the head of a contingent sent to help him, and his officers, *jāghirs* in the taluks of Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and Tiruvati, comprehended in the irrigation area of the anicut at Tiruveṇṇainallūr. Shivanāth Singh was given charge of the *killēdāri* of Chengi (Gingee), Madanmust and Dēsur and is said by the Tamil chronicler to have come into possession of his *killēdāri* charge in Fasli 1107, cyclic year, *Isvara*.

According to the account of Nārāyanan, which is embodied in the Mack. Mss., (translated by Dr. S. K. Aiyangar in his article on Rāja Dēsiṅg of Gingee in the *Journal of Indian History*, vol. IX, 1930), Zūlfikar Khān, after taking possession of Gingee in 1698 seems to have entrusted it to one Gussafar Khān (Kasbur Khān of Nārāyan and Gassafar Khan of the Fort St. George Records.) We find a reference, in one of the letters, found in the *Minutes and Consultation Book* of 24th May 1698 (page 58), to Gassafar Khān, who is mentioned therein as the late governor of Gingee. Probably by May 1698, he had ceased to be its governor. Further, Zūlfikār Khān seems to have appointed at first as the *faūjdar* of the Carnatic, Dāūd Khān, who was his second in command in the siege

of Gingee and who was reported to have been primarily responsible for the capture of its strongest fort by a strategic assault on it. The appointment seems to have been made by the orders of the Mughal Emperor in *Fasli* 1108 or 1698 A.D.

Muhammad Śayyid Khān was made the *deewan*, while Lālā Daḥin Roy became the *deewan-pēshkār* and Lālā Tōdarmāll, the *sheristadar* of the Carnatic; this last person later on played some part in the quarrel between Sādatullāh Khān and Dēsiṅg. Zūlfikār Khān had given the name Nasrat Gaddah to the fort of Gingee,—his full title being Amīr-ul-umara Nasrat Jang,—in honour of his victory. He effected many other changes in the *personnel* of the administration, by the presentation of *jāghirs* to several of his officers. Thus Sardār Sivanāth Siṅgh was given the *killēdāri* of Gingee, in addition to a *mansab*, in 1697-8. The *jāghir* consisted of seven taluks when given to Sivanāth Siṅgh (held in the Tamil Chronicle to have been a follower of the Rajah of Jaipur, by the Mughal Emperor. The *South Arcot District Gazetteer* (Vol. I, page 365) refers to the above fact and says that the *jāghir* was probably Mēlachēri or Old Gingee which was apparently a fortified place situated some miles to the north-west of the fort. The *jāghir* is also referred to have been

one of the biggest in the southern districts. We have not been able to ascertain the history of the *jāghir* except from the *Mackenzie Chronicle*. We may take that the Gingee *jāghir* was in the hands of Sivanāth Singh about 1699 A.D., *i.e.*, after Gussafar Khān had retired. The date given in the manuscript *Chronicle* for his acquisition of the *jāghir* as 1697-98, is perhaps a little bit inaccurate, for Gingee had not then passed into the hands of the Mughals, as the siege ended only in January 1698.

Under these circumstances Aurangzib seems to have granted a Bundēla chieftain, Sarūp Singh, a *mānsab* of 2,500 rank and a *jāghir* of 12 lakhs, along with the *killēdāri* of Gingee. Sarūp Singh, according to the *Tamil Chronicle*, was an officer in immediate attendance on the Raja of Bundelkhand, Sarūp Singh by name. Aurangzib got his services from the Raja and sent him to Zūlfikār Khān, with a *farman* appointing him governor of Gingee. In the *Despatches to England of 1711—1714*, (page 71), we find a reference to Sarūp Singh who is described as a considerable prince and a Rajput and also as being related to the Mughal family. The latter statement might perhaps have meant that he was related to one of the Rajput ladies in the harem of the Emperor.

Under this *farman*, the Nawab Amīr-ul-umara gave him the *killēdāri* of Gingee and sent him on to Gussafar Khān, who was probably then in charge of the district. Sarūp Singh entered on the office of the *killēdār* of Gingee in A.D. 1700 (cyclic year Vikrama, *Fasli* 1,110).

The Fort St. George records refer to Sarūp Singh as the *killēdār* of Gingee on the 18th January 1700, when one Rāmalinga promised to procure for the English merchants at Fort St. David the privilege of coinage in the Cuddalore mint¹, which was within the jurisdiction of the governor of Gingee.

The Mack. *Chronicle* says that Sarūp Singh took charge from Gussafar Khān, who afterwards retired and joined the court of the Nawab. Thus the *Chronicle* of Nārāyanan gives the account of the change of administration at Gingee:—"Under this *farman*, the Nawab, Amīr-ul-Umāra, gave him the *killēdāri* of Gingee and sent him with the order to Kisafar Khān (the Gussafar Khān of the Company's Records) and Kākar Khān. Sarūp Singh entered office as *killēdār* of Gingee in the year *Fasli* 1110, year Vikrama, (or A.D. 1700) and took possession of the fortress of Gingee. *Killēdār* Kisafar Khān and *faujdar* Kākar Khān retired and joined the army of

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1699—1700* : p. 10.

the Nawab. Payya Rāmakriṣṇa was appointed *vāknavis* (recorder). Shaikh Nur was appointed head of the guard. Shikar Udaya Rām became the *jupya navis* (writer of replies to petitions). Chalchiram became *tahavildar* (treasurer). Sri Ram became *huzur amani* (collector of revenue) Other officials like *huzur mendi* (supervisor of boundaries?) *huzur topchi* (commander of artillery) and others of the Padushayi service, numbering 5,000 remained as *killa dhainath* under the orders of the Nawab. Sarūp Singh kept with him this *dhainath* 5,000, along with his own three hundred horse, took possession of his own *jaghīr* of the eight-fold *parganah* in Gingee, Valudāvur, Tiṇdivanam, Tiruvāmāṭṭur, Asapur, Tirukkōvilur, Vēṭṭaivanam and other places. Nawab Amīr-ul-Umāra Zūlfikār Khān Bahadur Nasrat Jang, in accordance with the orders of the Padusha, made over the *faujdāri* of the Karnatak to Dāud Khān as its *faujdār*, Muḥamad Śayyīd Khān as its *dewan*, Tōdar Māll as its *sheristadar*, and reached Aurangabad in the same year of Vikrama.”²

**Sarup Singh's Administration according
to the Mack. Mss.**

One Payya Rāmakriṣṇa was appointed the *vāknavis* or the secretary, while Sheikh

² *Journal of Indian History*, 1930, Vol. IX, p. 12.

Nur was made the head of the guard. The reference to the *vāknavis* of Sarūp Singh is given in one of the letters to Fort St. George of May 1700.³ It refers to the Deputy Governor's letters to Sarūp Singh and to his *vāknavis* in relation to the renters, who were the occasion of the later quarrels between Sarūp Singh and the English. Sarūp Singh's jurisdiction seems to have included the eight *parganahs* of Gingee, Valudāvur, Tiṇdivanam, Tiruvāmāttur, Asuppūr, Tiruk-kōilur, Vēṭṭaianam and places nearby, all in the modern district of South Arcot. The extent of his government is also confirmed by the Madras Records. The Diary of Minutes and Consultations of 1703, while referring to the power of Sarūp Singh, gives the following information. "He commands to the value of 12 lakhs of pagodas yearly, and is an absolute Governor of Gingee granted by the Mughal farman which includes Cuddalore, Tiruppā-puliyur and Maṇjakuppam."

Nawab Amīr-ul-Umāra had been, in the meantime, called to Aurangabad and he had to hand over charge to Dāūd Khān. *Dewan* Muhammad Sayyīd Khān and *sheristadar* Tōdar Māll continued in their offices under him. Dāūd Khān had for his head-quarters

³ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1699—1700*, p. 49.

the town of Arcot, as Gingee was found unhealthy. He seems to have conducted the administration efficiently, according to the standards of those days. He may be regarded as the first regular Nawab of the Carnatic.*

* A note regarding the political divisions of the country under the Mughal dominion in South India below the Krishna :—

Carnatic-*Payanghat* (Carnatic below the Ghats): The region denominated as the Carnatic, comprehended, in the 18th century, the dominions and dependencies of the Nawab of Arcot and extended from the Guntur Circar, being bounded on the north by the small river Gundalakama which falls into the sea at Mōtupalli, over all the coast country as far south as Cape Comorin. The territory south of the Coleroon was known as Southern Carnatic and was rather a tributary to the Nawab than his real possession. Central Carnatic extended from the Coleroon to the North Pennar, and Northern Carnatic from the North Pennar, to the Guntur Circar.

Payanghat or *Talaghat* is the name given to the coast portion of the Carnatic region to the east of the Ghats, as distinguished from *Balaghat*, the country to the west of the Ghats. [See, Maclean: *Manual of the Madras Presidency*, Vol. III, pp. 67; Hamilton: *Description of Hindustan and the Adjacent Countries*, Vol. II, Section, Carnatic; and Wilks: '*A Historical Sketch of Southern India in an attempt to trace the History of Mysoor*,' (2nd Edition), Vol. II, pp. 134—136.]

The Hyderabad-Carnatic (part of the Carnatic conquered by the Golconda state and controlled from Hyderabad) included, according to the records, a *Balaghat* portion and a *Payanghat* portion. The *Balaghat* portion of it comprised the five *circars* of Sidhout, Gandikotta, Gooty, Gurrumkonda and Cumbum. All these, except Gooty, afterwards went to form the petty state of the Pathan Nawabs of Cuddapah. Gooty fell into the hands of the Maratha house of Ghorepade, of whom Murāri Rao distinguished himself in the Anglo-French wars of the 18th

century. The *Payanghat* portion of the Hyderabad-Carnatic comprised the whole coast country, extending from Guntur on the north to the present South Arcot district; this was afterwards better known as the *subah* of Arcot and formed the nucleus of the dominions of the Nawabs of the Carnatic. It included Northern Carnatic as defined above and a portion of Central Carnatic.

The *Bijapuri-Cārnatīc* (the portion conquered by the Adil Shāhīs of Bijapur in the 17th century) seems to have been all *Balaghat*, though it had also a *Payanghat* portion which included Vellore, Gingee, and Tanjore, all of which were conquered by Bijapuri commanders like Randaula Khān and Shāhji, the father of the celebrated Shivāji. It chiefly consisted of the settled upland districts of Bangalore and Sera; and it was entitled to the forced tributes exacted from the chiefs of Harpanahalli, (in the Bellary District), Kundapur (in the South Kanara, District), Anegodi, Bednore, Chitaldrug, and Mysore. The two circars of Adoni and Nandyal, situated to the south of the Tungabadhra river, were excluded from the Carnatic, as well as that of Savanur-Bankapur.

Thus we see that Bijapuri-Carnatic comprised mostly *Balaghat* territory; and Golconda-Carnatic included both *Balaghat* and *Payaghat* portions. In 1713, when the Nawabs of Arcot had just established their dominion, the whole of the *Balaghat* section of the Hyderabad-Carnatic with a little extension to the south, was in the possession of the Pathan chief of Cuddapah and the Mahratta chief of Gooty. The governorship of the Two Carnatics of which we read in histories, consisted therefore of the *Balaghat* portion of the Bijapuri-Carnatic and the *Payanghat* portion of the Hyderabad-Carnatic; and Nawab Saadatullāh Khan retained the government of the Two Carnatics for four years. When Amir Khan was appointed to the charge of the Bijapuri-Carnatic, it became usual to call the Nawabs of Cuddapah, Sira and Arcot after their respective capitals. There were the two additional Nawabs of Kurnool and Savanore. It was between these rulers that political power was distributed in the eighteenth century in all the regions to the south of the Krishna, with the exception of Mysore, Travancore, Madura and Tanjore.

Nawab Dāūd Khān was appointed deputy subhadar of the Deccan after the promotion of Zūlfikār Khān to the dignity of Subhadar. He was an Afghan and the son of Khizr Khān Panni and had served for several years under Aurangzib before he became the lieutenant of Zūlfikār Khān in the government of the Carnatic and later in the viceroyalty of the Decan. He was in charge of the *nizāmat* of Carnatic *Payanghat* in the years 1700—1708 and was killed in battle by a match-lock shot when opposing Šayyid Hussain Ali, by secret orders from the Emperor Farrukh Siyar.* He (Dāūd Khān) was followed by Muhammad Šayyid Khān as the Nawab of Arcot and *Faujdar* of the Carnatic in 1710 A.D. Dāūd Khān, in accordance with the imperial orders, appointed Muhammad Sayyid Khan, his *diwan*, to carry on the administration and left for the imperial court.

Sādatullāh Khān, originally named Muhammad Šayyid, was left by Dāūd Khān to

* "As *Naib* of the Nawab Zūlfikār Khān, he carried on the administration of the *subah* of Arcot with justice and equity. He never tolerated injustice and oppression of the people. His rule was one of kindness and compassion. He bred up two dogs of wonderful stature, and never separated himself from them. He called the male 'Khizr Khān' after his father, and the female 'Bassu' after his mother. When criminals were brought before him, he set these dogs upon them." (*Tuzak-i-Walājāhi* by Burhan Ibu Hasan,—tr. by S. M. H. Nainar: Part I p. 63).

be his *diwan* and *faujdar* in 1708. According to the *Sādat-nāmah*, a Persian history of his House,* he was appointed as the Nawab of the Two Carnatics in 1713 under Nizām-ul-Mulk, immediately after the succession of Farrukh Siyar. He was the regular and acknowledged Nawab of the Carnatic between the years 1710 and 1732 A.D. According to the *Maāsir-ul-Umara* he held the Nawabship from the time of Aurangzib till 1732. He died much regretted by his subjects.

* “ *Said Namah*, a pompously written biography of Saādat Allāh Khān, entitled also M. Said (properly M. Ali b. Ahmad d. 1142/1732) from his birth in 1651 to Ramadhan 1732. (Autobiography near the beginning of the *Said Namah*) ” (P. 778 of *Persian Literature. A Bio-Bibliographical Survey* by C. A. Storey, Sec. II. Fasciculus 3, M. History of India, 1939).

It was Dāud Khān that transferred his head-quarters from Gingee to the southern bank of the Palar at the place which subsequently became the town of Arcot. From Arcot he conducted the work of the *fāujdari* of the Carnatic on the lines laid down by his predecessors, particularly Nawab Zūlfikār Khān. In the picturesque language of Nārāyanan, he collected “the *nazar* and *peishkush* arranged for him from killēdārs, jaghir-dārs, mansabdars, the pōligārs who were established from the time of the Rajas and others. He also sent out *amildars* for collecting the *amani* dues from the *khalsa* lands, the revenues from the *koti* at Bhandar (Masulipatam) and remitted to the *Huzur* the 15 lakhs, the *irsal* amount according to the *ijari*. He built for himself a bungalow in Mylapore and fortified that town. He conducted the administration with justice and remained in Arcot till the *fasli* year 1114 (A.D. 1704).”

Though a digression, the author would insert the following note on Nawab Dāud Khān and the English

at Madras, at this place, because of the light that it throws on the character of the Nawab and his attitude towards the European settlements on the Coast.

“In 1699 Nawab Dāud Khān, who was then the deputy of Nawab Zulfikar Khān, visited Madras and spent a week at San Thomē. Dāud Khān succeeded his master as the Nawab of the Carnatic and Gingee countries in 1700; soon after he came down to Arcot he sent to the English at Madras for “sundry sorts of liquors.” On that occasion presents were sent to him through Sehnor Nicolo Manucci, a Venetian, who was then resident at Madras and was a very interesting personality of those days.

Nawāb Dāud Khān regarded the presents sent to him as inadequate and sent Manucci back with a threat that he would appoint a separate governor for Black Town and would develop San Thomē at the expense of Madras. Manucci says in his account that the Nawab received him very favourably and gave him reasonable and satisfactory answers and the Governor himself was satisfied with his embassy, though the official resolution of the Council was otherwise.

A few months later, in July 1701, Dāud Khān arrived at San Thomē with 10,000 troops, horse and foot. It seemed as if hostilities would break out and Pitt prepared for a stout resistance. But the Nawab changed his mind, said that he was prepared to receive the presents that he had previously refused and even offered to dine with the Governor. The dinner was accompanied with the presents and the gift of a great quantity of wines and cordials. The next day the Nawab could not go, as he wished, in a boat to visit one of the English ships in the roads, on account of having become very drunk overnight. This was followed by another threatening visit of the Nawab to San Thomē and the Governor had to prepare for yet another threatened outbreak of hostilities. Soon the Nawab began a strict blockade of the city and stopped all goods going in or out. The inhabitants of Egmore, Purasawakam and Triplicane fled through fear; and application was made by the Council to the Dutch and the Danes for assistance. The blockade extended to the other English settlements on the coast, but was rais-

An account of the Nawab and his rule given by a hostile historian, Burhan-ibu-Hasan,* is worth study as it also reveals quite a favourable picture of the, besides giving his origin and rise. “Sādatuḷḷāh Khān was from

ed after some weeks, when the English agreed to pay 25,000 rupees and the Nawab returned all the plundered goods.

On yet another occasion, the Nawab visited San Thomē; and though no hostilities were apprehended, Governor Pitt took care to make preparations for a defence. This visit terminated with a large dinner which was sent to the Nawab, the Governor not caring to admit into the Fort the large number of men who escorted him. This was in 1706. Two years later, the Nawab came at the head of 2,500 troops and went away grumbling at the insufficiency of the presents given to him. His final letter to Governor Pitt had reference to a demand for strong waters, as was expected. Dāud Khān wrote a letter to the Governor from Golconda for the supply of 1,000 bottles of liquor; and the Council resolved to send him 250, and also two large mastiffs that had been got from Europe.

The acquisition of Mylapore was not to be seriously thought of; but a grant was received in September 1708, through Dāud Khān, then camping at San Thomē, for five villages, namely, Tiruvoṭṭiyūr, Nungambākam, Vyāsarpādi, Kathiwākam near Ennore and Sāṭṭangādu, west of Tiruvoṭṭiyūr. There were the usual protracted negotiations about the fixing of the rents of these places which were henceforward known as “the five new villages.” A *farman* granted these villages as a free gift with effect from the 5th of October 1708.

* Burhan-ibu Hasan was a *protegé* of Nawab Muhammad Ali, the son of the founder of rival Nawabi family which superseded the Naits and wrote his history—*Tuzuk-i-Walajahi*—in praise and justification of his patrons. (This has been translated by Dr. S. M. H. Nainar of the Madras University).

the people of *nawayat*. The word '*nawāyat*' is the plural form of the singular '*nāit*,' a tribe of Arabs. There are different views about their origin. According to the investigations of the historian Tabari, they are the descendants of the children of the Quraysh. The author of the '*History of Yemen*' says that they come from the tribe of sailors. The writer of *Jami'ul-lubab* says that they are the nobles of Kufa. However that may be, they emigrated from their native home owing to the tyranny of Hajjaj bin Yusuf, and reached the coast of Hind (India) by sea. They settled in the region of Konkan in the territory of the Mahrattas."

Two *Nāit* brothers Muhammad Śayyīd and Gulām Ali who were in very poor circumstances in the Konkan, sought service in the camp of the Emperor Aurangzib for entertainment as troopers. The elder, Muhammad Śayyīd, was of short stature and ungainly in appearance and was first rejected; but by good fortune, he got an effective amulet and thereby got favour in the eyes of the Emperor who, much to the astonishment of his officers, appointed him to his service.

"As days rolled on Muhammad Sa'id, from the position of a servant, found his entry into the group of *mansabdars*. With the title of

Sā'adatullāh Khān, he accompanied Dāwud Khān, and was appointed to the post of Diwan. Thus, he grew prosperous day by day. In the *subah* of Arcot, he was for twenty years *Naib* to the Nazim and for five years *Nazim*. The fame of his administration was sung for twenty-five years on the whole. He devoted his high purpose to the welfare of the creation and to the organisation of his army. He was a follower of the Twelve Imams, and had faith in the sect of Ja'far. He had in his heart the interests of his relatives and the members of his family. He invited them from Konkan and bestowed on them *jagirs* and forts. His younger brother, Ghulām Āli who was at the court of the Padshah, was granted the *jagir* of Vellore, and given the title of 'Khān.' He tried to comfort and console the poor, the orphan and the needy. The people regarded his days as the best of the past, and were of one accord in praising the justice of his *nizāmat*. He had no issue, and so adopted one of the sons of his uncle and named him 'Khān Bahadur.' Then, the *nazim* of his soul (*ruh*) left the *nizamat* (of the kingdom) of his borrowed body." *

* The *Tuzuk-i-Walajahi* Part I. tr. by Dr. S. M. H. Nainar: pp. 68-9.

Our chronicler, Nārāyanan, is equally enthusiastic in his praise of the justice and equity and also of the

Muhammad Śayyīd Khān appointed one Dakhin Rōy as his deputy and got many favours for his own men. The Emperor sent him a *mansab* of 3,000 men and also the title of Śādatuḷḷah Khān. He proved a good administrator in the Carnatic by keeping himself on good terms with his neighbouring rulers and by the proper collection and remittance of revenue to the Mughal government of the Deccan.

cleverness of Śādatuḷḷah. His words are worth repeating. "Sayyad (Sadatūḷḷah) Khān carried on his administration appointing Rōy Dakhiniray as his *diwan*. He got for his elder brother, Ghulām Âli Khān the *killēdāri* of Vēlūr by recommending to the head-quarters and obtaining their *farman* and *tasviṣnama*. Ghulām Âli Khān thus got the *killēdāri* of Vēlūr with a *mansab* of one thousand. He also wrote his reports and obtained the necessary *farmans* and *tasviṣnama* in favour of the *killēdārs* of his own choice for the Karnatakghād, Kailasghad, Wandiwash, Timiri, and other places in the Karnatak. The Padusha accordingly sent to Sayyad Khan a *mansab* of 3,000 and the title Śādat-ullah Khān. Nawab Śādatuḷḷah Khān proved a good administrator of the Karnatak, keeping himself on good terms with the *jaghirdars* of the Karnatak and the Rajas of Trichinopoly, Tanjore, Madura and Vēṅkatagiri, collecting from them the due *peshkash* as well as the other revenues from the *sircar* taluks according to the established arrangements. He collected the dues with justice and remitted the dues to the head-quarters along with the accounts as the fixed time. He also managed to be on good terms with the officials of the *diwan's* office (*mutṣadis*) by means of gifts, *takhrīr* and *paridāna*. While everybody concerned spoke well of him, the Padusha was greatly pleased with him as a very efficient administrator, fully justifying the expectations of his youth as very intelligent young man.

After the retirement of Dāud Khān, Sarūp Singh was confirmed in his office by Sādatuḷḷah Khān and by his *diwan* Dakhin Rōy. Sarūp Singh seems to have affected some measure of independence during the confusion that followed the death of Aurangzib. As the new Emperor, Bahadur Shah, was troubled on all sides by the Marathas and the Rajputs, and by the Sikh and the Jat risings in the subahs of the Punjab and Agra respectively, Sarūp Singh was able to assume a truculent attitude and began to evade the payment of the usual tribute. In the reign of Farrukh Siyar when the Śayyid brothers were dominant, this loss of revenue was felt and Sarūp Singh was ordered to arrange for payment of arrears. Sarūp Singh could have managed to pay up the arrears with his enormous income of 12 lakhs of pagodas a year. He seems to have evaded all payment of the arrears and died in 1714 without settling the question. Sarūp Singh not only evaded payment of the usual *peshkash* or *nazar*, but also took forcible possession of the *khalisa* villages of the *sarkar* and openly and continuously disregarded the orders of the *faujdar* with respect to these matters. Sādatuḷḷah Khān continued patiently for some time; and when nothing would come out of his repeated warnings, he intimated the situation, according to

the chronicler, in his report to the Pādshāh (Emperor) and sent a separate statement that Sarūp Singh's arrears of payments due to the *faujdāri* amounted to 70 lakhs of rupees, with accounts filed in proof of his statement. Further, we read in the *Chronicle* that the Emperor examined the accounts and was assured of the continued and defiant default; he thereupon ordered the agent of Sarūp Singh at court to be arrested and directed that he might write to his master immediately to pay up the arrears to the Nawab of the Carnatic. Having learnt of these proceedings and of the endeavour made by Nawab Sādatullāh to prove his case and to persuade the imperial *diwani* office to take severe measures against the defaulter, Sarūp Singh became "sorrow-stricken and falling ill, died sometime later." *

In the beginning of reign of Farrukh Siyar, Sarūp Singh had been a defaulter for ten years and the Nawab of Arcot had reported to the Pādshāh that the arrears amounted to 70

* "When some nobles at the imperial court spoke in favour of Sarūp Singh, Tipudas, the agent of Sādatullāh Khān "worked through the agency of the court *darōgah* Kutbu'ddin, undertaking to pay two lakhs of rupees to the durbar for expenditure through the Bukkansi Kasi-das' business-house;" he "also filed a *darkhāst* in these terms at the *huzur* office. Having seen these the Pādushāh sent a *farman* informing Sādatullāh of this and issued orders on these terms to Sarūp Singh."

lakhs. A letter from Madras written to England on January 31, 1714, says: "We have lately found that the country round about is peaceable and that the Raja of Gingee, Sarūp Singh, is lately dead and a new Governor is expected to succeed him." *

According to the popular ballad of Dēśing, Sarūp Singh is not mentioned as the father of Dēśing, but one Tēraṇi Singh is mentioned therein. Tēraṇi Singh ruled Gingee conjointly with his brother, Tarani Singh, whose father is mentioned as one Sura Singh. Though Nārāyana Pillai's account ought to have contained the information furnished by the ballad, we do not find the mention of Tēraṇi Singh and Tarani Singh as being related to Rāja Dēśing at all. The ballad refers to the story that Tēraṇi Singh, who was imprisoned at Delhi, was absolved of his arrears of tribute by his son Dēśing, who by taming a wonderful horse of the Emperor, was able to secure his release. The Fort St. George records do not mention anything about the imprisonment of Dēśing's father and his release by the efforts of his son.

Sarūp Singh from the English Records

The name of Sarūp Singh is written variously as Surōp Singh, Serōōp Singh and

* *Despatches to England, 1711—1714, page 191.*

Syrōōp Singh, in the Madras records. They contain the correspondence between the Councils of Fort St. David and Fort St. George and their despatches to England about the events that took place concerning them. These records furnish abundant information about the relations between the English Company and Sarūp Singh. Nārāyana Pillai's *Chronicle* does not give much information about Sarūp Singh and the events of his administration.

It has been noted above that Sarūp Singh was granted the *jāghir* of Gingee worth 12 lakhs, consisting of eight *parganahs* which included within their jurisdiction, Cuddalore, Tirupāpuliyūr and Maṇjakuppam. The jurisdiction comprehended in his *jāghir* helps the reader to understand the struggles that took place between him and the Council of Fort St. David.

We have already seen that the English Company purchased Fort St. David, then known as the Fort of Dēvanāmpatnam, near Cuddalore, from Rāma Rāja, the Maratha ruler of Gingee, in June 1690 after long negotiations. Sarūp Singh's *jāghir* included the villages adjacent to Fort St. David also.

Sarūp Singh rented his *parganahs* at favourable rates to the rich inhabitants living in his *jāghir* by giving them alluring promises,

which he, however, never kept. Hence the relationship between the renters and Sarūp Singh in general were strained and unsatisfactory. In accordance with the instructions of the Fort St. George Council, William Fraser, Chief of the Council of Fort St. David, brought about, in 1700, an agreement between the renters and Sarūp Singh, who was obliged to give a *farman* of assurance and also substantial security to the said renters and a promise not to exact any more than what had been agreed upon in his cowles.*

* "Thursday, 24th April.—The Governor acquainting the Council that this morning he received advice from Mr. Fraser at Fort St. David, that the Dutch had been at Conineer a viewing, surveying, and measuring a Factory there that was formerly ours; and that Dāwood Khān's Mauldars were with them. So it is rational to believe that the Dutch have a design to purchase it of this Nabob. To prevent which, for that it would not only be a great inconveniency to our affairs at Fort St. David's, but likewise a great discredit to see a Dutch Flag hoisted upon our English settlement; it is resolved that the Governor writes a letter to Governor Conans, who is still at Sadraspatam, to acquaint him with what he hears, and if possible to prevent his making any further progress therein." This journey was postponed till after the departure of Dāud Khan.

"Thursday, 27th May.—We being informed that Dāwood Khān is coming to Chillambaram, near Fort St. David's, against which place we have just reason to fear he has ill designs; it is proposed by the President that he himself goes thither on the "Advice" frigate, with two of the Council of this place and the Secretary, and carry with them thirty men of this Garrison, and stores and necessaries for presents, which accordingly are ordered to be provided." (Wheeler's *Madras in the Olden Time*, pp. 199-200).

The first occasion of a quarrel of Sarūp Singh with the Fort St. David Council was not, however, occasioned by any friction over the treatment of the renters. Sarūp Singh seems to have threatened the English factors by hindering the free carriage of provisions and firewood to Cuddalore according to the Council's letter. (Letter to Fort St. George dated 8th April 1700). It ends thus: "The reasons for such an action are not known; whether it be to amuse us or allure their friendship by a present." But for this event that took place in 1700, Sarūp Singh had been maintaining peaceful relations with the English.

Probably as a sequel of this, Nawab Dāud Khān entertained an evil design on Fort St. David, in March-April 1701, which was believed to be a plan to seize it by force and transfer it to the Dutch who were held to "have a design to purchase it of the Naboh." Soon this fear passed away. No other records are available to prove any enmity of Sarūp Singh towards Fort St. David Council before the year 1710 when troubles began on the question of the renters. We find in the despatches to England, dated October 1711, a reference made to the peace prevailing in the country before the war. It says: "We had enjoyed perfect peace with the people of

Gingee. They never disturbed us, nor ever thought of doing so, till the faithless Governor of Fort St. David sacrificed the interests of the Company to his own filthy lucre by protecting their just debtors and engaging his word to see them forthcoming, at the same time not only conniving at but contributing to their escape caused the troubles." This shows that there was unbroken peace between Sarūp Singh and the English settlement of Fort St. David before 1710.

In accordance with his usual practice, Sarūp Singh had rented the territories of Valudāvūr and Tegnapatam, the latter being circumjacent to the bounds of Fort St. David, to one Sheva Reddi Nayak and others who were having mercantile dealings with the Council at Fort St. David. These renters, having evaded their liabilities to Sarūp Singh and failing to get satisfaction from one Gabriel Roberts, the then Governor of Fort St. David, who stood security for them, captured Lieutenant James Hugonin and Ensign Ray, two officers of the garrison, confined them within the fort at Gingee and treated them with great barbarity. In the course of an attempt at retaliation by the authorities of Fort St. David, some fatalities occurred and open hostilities ensued.

Robert Raworth was sent to Fort St. David, as its Deputy Governor, with ships and reinforcements under Captain Roach. A smart action took place in August 1711 in which Captain Coventry and Ensign Somerville were killed. After further fighting matters were brought to a conclusion through the mediation of M. Hëbert, the French Governor of Pondicherry, and the prisoners were released after a captivity of two years. Before news of the peace concluded between England and France in 1713 reached India, Hëbert had mediated in the Gingee quarrel with success.

A Detailed Account of the War

Fort St. David and Cuddalore had been granted to the English Company by a *cowle* of Rāmarāja in 1690, in preference to the high bidding of the Dutch who were rivals for the acquisition of the place. After the conquest of Gingee by Zulfikār Khān, whom the English helped with money, arms and gunpowder, he was pleased to confirm the grant of Rāmarāja along with other privileges which were secured by Mr. Elihu Yale through the mission of Messrs. Trenchfield and Pitt.¹

¹ Madras Diary of Minutes and Consultations, February 1691, page 14.

For the version of Sarūp Singh's people of the manner and growth of the English acquisitions, it will

be of interest for the reader to study, *verbatim*, the letter of Hanumāji Pantulu to Serappa, the Company's merchant at Fort St. David, dated November 1711 and included in the Consultations of the Council of that settlement for November 28, 1711.

“The Mogulls Dominions reach from Rāmēsharum to Europe, and Serūp Sing under soe great a prince Commands to the amount of twelve Lack of Pagodas, Early, and absolute Govr. of Chinjee, granted by the Mogulls Phirmaund, which includes Cuddalore, Trepopulore, Mangée Cupang, &c. Towns which intitling us to a propriety of Claim, wee therefore, according to our Lawfull Title, are come to demand and discourse about ‘em, soe that if you can produce any writeings Authentick that nominates your Title, desire you’l produce ‘em, and wee shall act accordingly, but can’t show us any such writeings, you have settled yourselves at Tevenapatam and secur’d yourselves all the Towns under it by your Craft and Bribery hitherto, makeing yourselves Masters of bounds and to the time enjoying the product, but wee can’t any longer suffer such doeings, and now make our demands on your bounds, conformable to our grant from the Great Mogull, wee are assur’d you have noe Lawfull Title, and by your Subtilty have infring’d and imposed (as an Enemy) on the Great King. Your revenues amount to twelve thousand Chuckroms per Annum, and doe farther declare that whosoever opposes our takeing possession of Cuddalore and Tevenapatam are Enemys to the Great Mogull, and for every horse that may be lost on such occasion, must be answerable ten thousand Pagodas, to which I call the following Evidence, and take their Attestations to forward the Great Mogull, demonstrating the impositions you have been guilty off, to say Caune Guoy Deskemouke Darroga Mooshareeff Buxee Busaude, ’tis well known the Mogull Labour’d twelve years and at an immense Charge to Conquer Chingee Country to install Surop Sing, and your purchase was in the time of the Morrattas trouble, and by firing your Gunn extended your bounds as Cuddalore to the Southward and Whichemeer to the Northward, and the Town of Trepopulore you gott by Bribery, which is worth two thousand Chuckroms per annum, and your being there seems purposely to encroach on the King’s Countrey, which will involve all your Sea

Ports in irreparable trouble, your proper place is only Tevenapatam, but you have for these twelve years enjoy'd forceably ten Towns, besides thats worth twelve thousand Chuckroms yearly, which wee shall now demand by Virtue of the Kings Phirmaund on our heads, when you'l know better and can only compare you to the Fuckers of the country, who make a Trade of begging and are generally the greatest thieves imaginable, soe you in the name of Merchants are destroying and turning utter enemys to the Mogull, but as wee eat the Kings salt you shall find how we'll serve you now, in the Waldore Country, you have destroy'd forty towns and fifty thousand Chuckroms of Paddy and Yembolum Pandar, a man unarm'd and praying to God, with thirty men was kill'd, and plunder'd to the amount of ten thousand Pagodas, there people went to the Duans Brother with the complaint and he wrote to Surop Sing to gett 'em the money again, and you plunder'd Laula Deepsa, whose horses and money you are posses'd off, and want to know in what manner you can acquit yourselves of this, and because wee came to demand our due of twelve thousand Chuckroms yearly on your bounds, you runn into our Country and burn and plunder above one hundred thousand, the occasion of our enlargeing soe is upon the Accot. of your inviteing us in a friendly manner, and keeping us forty days, thought was oblig'd to write, ought to have been done before, therefore send your answer what you think proper. This is the Mogulls Affair and allthough you may think to fee and acquire an accommodation by other means, you may depend it will never doe, and whoever may undertake being a Mediator will allways have reverence to our just pretences, which are in writeing, and be only a great expence to you, soe that if you'l quietly resign to us, or lett us peaceably take possession of Cuddalore and Trepopulore &ca. what you plunder'd in the Waldore Country, Damage to Yembolam Pandar, Shevenaigue Reddoes Debt of Eight thousand Chuckroms and its interest, and on our delivering Veraugoo Redde to Armittu Pillu, (who is the security for six thousand Chuckroms) you must make him pay the money and interest as alsoe the Charges of our Camp and then wee shall be very peaceable, otherwise shall remain here, being come on purpose to visitt you, soe wou'd advise you to keep your forces in usuall good order."

Now Sarūp Singh's jāghir extended as far as Cuddalore and Tegnapatam and he had rented out some portions of his estates to some inhabitants who lived within his bounds, but who had also mercantile and money dealings with the English at Fort St. David. In the particular case over which the quarrel broke out, Sarūp Singh had rented out the Valudāvur and Tegnapatam, (*alias*, Fort St. David) countries to one Woodga Naik who lived in Fort St. David¹ and who was helping in acquiring cloth for the Company's investment, in 1708 A.D., according to information contained in the letter from one Sheva Naik, son of Woodga Naik, embodied in the Fort St. David Consultations for 1713. He seems to have been in arrears, as we find in the above letter that the Naik was complaining to the Council of Fort St. David about the troubles persistently caused by Sarūp Singh. The Fort St. David Council probably did not care to interfere on that occasion. The letter further says :—
“Shortly after my father's death, my mother, myself and brother, who could not understand any business, took leave of the Governor and

¹ (*on page 229*). This Wodde Nague Reddi, as his name is spelt in the early records of the settlement, was a resident of the place even in 1697 when he reported to the chief *dubash* that some thieves were poaching about the neighbourhood, having come from Gingee with a design to steal horses out of the Company's bounds (*vide* Consultation of the 18th October, 1697).

resided outside the bounds.” This shows that the renters evading their liabilities were allowed to escape by the Governor of Fort St. David who was then one Roberts. Sarūp Singh was enraged at this and had several times in his letters demanded that Roberts should send up all the renters to him to enable him to adjust their accounts and to realise the arrears. The renters had however been allowed to escape. Since Sarūp Singh held that the English were responsible for the renters who had run away with his moneys, “by way of expediting a settlement,” he carried away two European officers of the garrison of Fort St. David and confined them in his fortress, treating them with great barbarity. The responsibility of Roberts is not sufficiently plain from the records. But the despatch to England of 5th October 1711 says:—“The injury being done on our side, legal satisfaction being demanded was not given at once where it ought.” The letter moreover accused the Governor of complicity in their escape which led to the capture of the military officers by Sarūp Singh and the resultant troubles. “The Raja however did not seize our people before he had several times demanded justice in a public manner both at Fort St. George and at Fort St. David and finding no means of notice taken of his de-

mands, proceeded to seize our men.” According to another record of August 1710 (*Madras Diary Minutes and Consultations 1710*, page 81) we find that one *Dubāsh* Vēṅkata Kriṣhna, received 300 pagodas to permit Sheva Naigu Reddi and others to go out of their bounds. The *dubāsh* was asked to be secured by the Council later on. Probably this person had acted in concert with Governor Roberts in the escape of the renters. We find, later on, how Roberts was taken to task and ordered to compensate for the losses incurred during the war on account of his liability for the renters’ escape. However, the renters’ property had been confiscated, as a later letter of Sheva Naik demanded the restoration of his property and permission to live in Tegnapatam.

Soon after the escape of the renters, a British ship which ran ashore between Fort St. David and Porto Novo was seized by Sarūp Siṅgh’s men, while the Governor of Fort St. David had to recover the goods by force. Even in 1709, Sarūp Siṅgh had claimed the right of seizing wrecked boats and their cargoes within his bounds, though the Council held that such a claim was “contrary to several *cowles* and *parwanas* granted to the Right Honourable Company by the former and successive kings of the country and of late years from Zulfikar Khān.” A consult-

ation of the Fort St. David Council of 27th October 1709, says that they ordered Mr. Farmer, Second in Council, to send out 12 soldiers and 20 peons and the owner of the wrecked boat which belonged to a *sampan* bound from Cuddalore to Madras and had been driven ashore a little to the north of the English bounds and to inform the captain of the garrison to send men so as to bring back the boat, avoiding hostilities.

On the 11th of June 1710, when Lieutenant Hugonin and Ensign Ray, two military officers of the Fort St. David garrison, went a hunting into the country beyond the bounds of the settlement, they were captured forcibly by a party of men and carried to the Valudāvur fort, distant about 20 miles from the place. We know already that Valudāvūr belonged to the Gingee jaghir. *The Despatches to England of the years 1701-1702 to (1710-1711, page 140)*, refers in detail to the above incident. “Mr. Haughton, one of covenanted servants of the Company, made his escape to Cuddalore and reported the event. Thereupon Montague, the then Deputy Governor, sent a party of men under Captain Vivers in vain.” The poor captives had been taken to Gingee by that time. A Fort St. George letter of 28th June 1710, refers to

the removal of the captives to Gingee. "Matters are far from mending, that they are grown from evil to worse, relating to the captives whom you say are sent from Waldore (Valudāvūr) to Gingee." The capture of these prisoners and the treatment accorded to them led to retaliations on the part of the Government at Fort St. David, which made the war continual and at the same time tedious and expensive for both sides, as can be seen from the records. The cause of the war is also revealed in a letter of Harrison, Governor of Fort St. George, whose rule was marked by military activity and the troubles with Sarūp Singh. "Upon my arrival troubles had arisen with the government of Gingee, who seized some of the English and carried them prisoners to Gingee on the occasion of some disgust of some former Governor, Gabriel Roberts."¹ The latter part of his letter reveals the mercantile interests of the Company. "We are but a handful of people and our business is trade and therefore all quarrels with the Gingee government are extremely prejudicial to us and destroy the end for which we have settled in those parts."²

¹ *Madras Diary of Minutes and Consultations 1711*, page 134.

² *Ibid.*

The treatment of the captives in Gingee

The captives were barbarously treated at Gingee and the treatment that they received caused great resentment in the minds of the Fort St. David Councillors. The unfortunate officers, according to a letter of June 1711, “were detained at Gingee and loaded with heavy irons which continued so long that their feet began to swell extremely. The heart of that stupid inhuman creature, Sarūp Singh is still so hardened that, notwithstanding the ruin of his country and people, it prevails on his obdurate temper, which will not be mollified except his avaricious humour be satisfied by money, which would be a very ill precedent and a great encouragement for others to follow.”¹ In another letter written to Captain Roach, the captain of the English forces in the Valudāvūr country,² we get a reference to the position of the unfortunate captives. “It evidently appears that they do not intend to release the captives who are in misery and in irons and make continual complaints of hardship and barbarous usage they

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George 1711*, pages 51-52.

² The *killa* of Valudāvūr was under the charge of Mahabat Khān who actively assisted Sarūp Singh in the measures taken against Fort St. David and who later became the faithful ally of Rāja Dēsing in the latter's rebellion against Nawab Sādatullah Khān.

receive at Gingee under the *Chaubauk* and being forced to stand in the sun till they are almost faint and dead and not allowed a little water to refresh them.”¹

Futile attempts made to secure the release of the prisoners

Several attempts were made by the Council of Fort St. David to secure the release of the prisoners. A letter of August 1710 (*Diary of Minutes and Consultations*, page 110) refers to the fact that the governor of Gingee desired a present of about 200 pagodas to be sent to him as a ransom for the release of the prisoners. In November of the same year (*Madras Diary of Minutes and Consultations*, page 114) a present was sanctioned to be sent to Sarūp Singh. The same letter explains the fact that “the present sent to the Governor of Gingee to accommodate all differences relating to the captives at Gingee did not take effect as it was not accompanied by a letter from the Governor.”² This reveals to us how arrogant Sarūp Singh was. We shall see later on from the Madras records how much of a fright he was to the Council of Fort St. David on account of his wealth and power.

¹ *Letters from Fort St. George 1711*, page 124.

² Page 121.

At the same time, the Madras Council desired that a present of the value of about 150 pagodas be sent to the Diwan (of the Nawabi, perhaps Sādatullāh Khān himself who was for long the Diwan), which was to be conveyed by a vakil or an *egib*. It was also desired by the Madras Council that the Deputy Governor should write a letter to Sarūp Singh, to go with the present which they sent from Madras (Consultation of the Fort St. David Council, dated December 9, 1710).

In August 1710, a letter was written from Madras to the Deputy Governor of Fort St. David, empowering him to use all ways and means to give Sarūp Singh's people all vexations, if the unfortunate captives were not released. In February 1711, an agent also was sent to Gingee to demand the restoration of the captives. Neither the present that was sent nor the presence of the agent had any effect on Sarūp Singh. The despatches to England of 1701-1711, refer to the above fact and further remark, that "the hungry officers about him who wanted to get something out of the bargain and who exercised some influence over him prevented his design."¹ The letter to Fort St. George of February 1711 refers

¹ *Despatches to England, 1701—1711, page 141.*

to the futile endeavours of the English. "Though all fair means had been tried by sending a present and also an agent to discourse with him about his demands and having waited two months for an answer there was no prospect of release. It is quite evident that he unjustly demands money and he will not clear our captives by fair means which has been sufficiently experimental. Therefore we hope that your honour will think of some proper methods to force him into a compliance." ¹

Measures of retaliation by the English

Towards the end of February 1711, an attempt was made by the Deputy Governor of Fort St. David to seize some chief men of the Gingee government who happened to be in the neighbourhood of Fort St. David, at the villages of Paṇḍasōlanallur, Rāmāpuram and Allāṅganaṭṭam. "Some of the chief men of the Gingee government were at Paṇḍasōlanallur, near the bounds of Fort St. David and in their endeavour to seize some of them in compensation for the long detained captives at Gingee, three men were killed." ² This event made the English apprehend trouble. The same letter contains a demand for provisions,

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1711*, pages 11-12.

² *Ibid.*

stores and ammunitions with a request for their quick despatch. 100 soldiers and 50 peons under the command of Gunner Hugonin were sent out for the purpose. The captain was ordered that if he could not seize those persons, he could seize such as he thought proper in the Valudāvūr country, but avoid bloodshed with Mahābat Khān unless it should be that “if any come to oppose you, then to repell force by force.” A *mokhasūdār* of Sarūp Singh died in an affray with the English troops; and one, Mōhan Singh, was captured and ordered to be kept a prisoner. Hugonin himself had to wrestle hard with a Moor who was killed by a gunshot by his companions; he hastened to file a petition to record the incident lest it would be “a handle to revengeful people to stain my reputation by laying it to my charge;” and so great was the fear of the Council that all the bastions and outposts of Fort St. David were duly secured with troops who were stationed in the block-houses and redoubts at Cuddalore, Tirupāpuliyūr and Baṇḍipālayam.¹ The letter of February 25, 1711, relates to the unfortunate accident of the English soldiers killing three of Sarūp Singh’s people. It says:—“Since writing the letter, Mahābat Khan of Valudāvur was making

¹ For the report of Hugonin and the disposition of the troops to protect the fort, see the Fort St. David Consultations of February 24th, 1711.

great preparations to come against the English ;” and it ends with a request for recruits.¹ Mahābat Khan had already demanded of the English that they should not make any attempt into the Gingee country.² News was also received that the envoys who went to Gingee with letters and presents to Sarūp Singh, had returned, having been frightened by threats that their lives would be endangered.

Chola Naik, the new friend of the English

In February 1711, one Chōla Naik, a great poligar near Gingee, being an enemy of Sarūp Singh, sought the protection of the English, for some of his people at Tirupāpuliur, (the western portion of the modern Cuddalore N.T.). The Council seem to have granted his request by a promise to send forces to do damage to the Gingee country.³ The English at Fort St. George, though they permitted the poligar to come to terms with the Fort St. David Council, warned the latter to have a watch over him lest he should join Sarūp Singh.⁴ In March 1711, a letter was written to Captain Roach, leading the English

¹ *Madras Diary and Consultation Book, 1711, page 143.*

² *Ibid.*

³ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1711, page 16.*

⁴ *Ibid page 120.*

forces in the Valudāvur country. It referred to the detention of the captives at Gingee despite the various just means taken to effect their release and concluded with the following words:—"Nothing but force will obtain their enlargement and reinstate the English to the good opinions of the natives and for which reason you are ordered to march into the Valudavur country, and to use all manner of hostility."¹ By 24th March 1711, Captain Roach and Captain Courtney had been despatched to the Valudāvur country to undertake all acts of hostility. The losses of the enemy in horse and foot were considerable. Several villages and a quantity of paddy were also reported to have been burnt. The destruction took place in the face of the enemy. The country was damaged again so that all means were tried to make Sarūp Singh listen to reason and release the captives.² The poligar Chōla Naik, who had become the friend of the English previously, also joined in the plunder of the country.³ In spite of these skirmishes and the losses that Sarūp Singh incurred, the captives were not released. The letter of April 17, 1711, shows that Sarūp Singh, or at least the officers under him, were

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1711, page 124.*

² *Ibid, page 121.*

³ *Ibid, page 122.*

so unbending that the captives would be released only on the payment of the very heavy sum of 30,000 chuckrams. On May 16, 1711, a party of soldiers was sent to prevent the plunder of the Valudāvūr country, as it was then the season of ploughing and sowing the obstruction of which would mean a considerable loss of revenue. Even this harsh measure on the part of the Fort St. David Government did not soften the heart of Sarūp Singh. The letter of Fort St. George of May 18, 1711 says :—" Your troubles have given us a great anxiety of thoughts and had not the good effect we designed, to bring that savage inhuman shape to a compliance in spite of your successful skirmishes." ¹ Hence the Council of Fort St. George had to give discretionary powers to that of Fort St. David, to send out another party of men into the Valudāvūr country, to impede the people ploughing and sowing, for himself to reason or to run the *hazard* of the ruin of his country." ² The luckless peasants of the entire country were wholly ruined by the English forces, and yet Sarūp Singh could not be moved. ³ In July 1711, the action of the Fort St. David Council was debated by the

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1711, page 122.*

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid, pp. 122-124.*

Council of Fort St. George, who felt that the former had acted in several respects most injudiciously and that great disorder prevailed among the garrison. An attempt was at the same time made to get the services of M. Hebert, the French Governor of Pondicherry, in an endeavour to patch up a reconciliation with Sarūp Singh; and Checca Sērappa, the Company's Chief Merchant at Madras, promised to use his good offices also and to render assistance to the Fort St. David Governor in ending the present troubles; and as he was known to be a crafty and cunning fellow and consequently of use to the Company, he was allowed to accompany the Governor. It was decided to send Ralph Raworth, a member of the Madras Council, with five English ships, to put a speedy end to the war. Raworth landed at Fort St. David on the 10th August, 1711 and immediately took charge as its Deputy Governor.

Progress of the war under Raworth.

July 1711 to May 1712

On arriving at Fort St. David, Mr. Raworth found that his immediate predecessor, Mr. Farmer, had ordered the destruction of a large quantity of grain and a large number of villages of the Gingee government and this needless act of destruction had only intensified the

exasperation and raised the demands of Sarūp Singh. The Indian merchants complained of the scarcity of paddy and of the dearness of cotton and it became necessary to send a yatch northward to procure grain, while the renters had run away and could not be persuaded by any inducements to return.

On August 16, 1711, a desperate fight took place between the troops of Fort St. David and the forces of Gingee near the bounds of the English settlement. There was a brisk firing from the enemy whose forces consisted of 400 horse and 1,000 foot under Mahābat Khān, while the English troops were under the command of Lieutenant Coventry and Ensign Somerville.* The latter proved a

* Somerville's conduct was so base that it is interesting to read the following account of it from the general letter of the Council to Fort St. George: "This treacherous and rascally example of an officer so despirited the men that they immediately followed it, breaking their ranks.....he met his fate at last, being taken by four horse-keepers, which first tied him to a tree and with a crooked knife cut off his head--that cowardly wretch making such submissions for the preservation of his life that will ever be a scandal to our Englishmen, for he not only used submissive expressions, but likewise fell down upon his face, eating the grass that the mean fellows trod on, which is amongst these country people as much as to say I am your slave and will be for the future as submissive as your dog, or any other beast that belongs to you." Mr. Garstin puts down this encounter as having occurred on the 11th August. The fight occurred on the night of the 16th, when the enemy entered the bounds and took possession of the walls of Whichimeer and Roach had to advance, sending a body of men under Coventry and Somerville to meet the enemy.

coward by running for his life, while the former showed extraordinary courage on the occasion, though in the end he had to succumb, his body being twice lanced and once shot through. Captain Roach was attacked on all sides and was left only with 40 men, many peons and even officers having fled. The loss of the enemy was computed to be 140 or 150 men killed and wounded, besides horses. The Council lamented the unhappy fate of Captain Coventry and the shameful behaviour of Ensign Somerville. Mahābat Khān of Valudāvūr was the captain of the Gingee forces; he was skilful in pulling away his horsemen as they fell and thought it best to withdraw from pursuit when Roach reached the walls of the fort. The letter of August 18, 1711, attributes the misfortunes to Somerville who fled and was deservedly killed.

Raworth was sent to make peace; and before he left for Fort St. David he was told that no money should be spent at all in effecting a settlement. But letters now reached Fort St. George requesting money and presents of various kinds to Sarūp Singh's envoys who had come down for a peace.¹ The terms offered for peace were put at 6,000 chuckrams

¹ *Minutes and Consultations of Fort St. George 1711*, page 141.

per annum and a decision was urged by Raworth for if the ambassadors were allowed to return to Gingee and come again, it would cost double the money.

A letter of 4th September 1711, relates to the old age of Sarūp Singh, to his administrative and other difficulties and to the attempts made to secure peace without payment. "We have sent him a letter, being willing to try all means possible rather than think of giving money." The English also hoped to take advantage of his old age and other troubles in persuading him to end the war. "It is most certainly true that the extraordinary charges he had incurred to carry on the war, besides the damage done to the country, had so impoverished him that he could not pay his troops and men were forced to plunder for subsistence which they daily do with the utmost severity. . . . We hope this would bring our forces against him and the war would end."¹

A letter of the 8th September 1711, sent from Fort St. George, asked Raworth to make peace as soon as possible so that "investment might go on briskly." It said:—"We approve the project of carrying the treaty to Gingee if you cannot get it to Fort St. David which would be much for your honour and interest. We hope you will find means to put an end to the war

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1711, page 85.*

speedily so that investment may go on briskly.”¹

Governor Harrison of Madras thought it politic to lay the whole matter before Nawab Zūlfikar Khān himself in the hope that his interference might mollify Sarūp Singh. His letter, dated 11th October 1711, was addressed to His Excellency Zūlfikar Khān Bahadur Nasrat Jang, Bakshi of the Mughal Empire and begged that the English might be excused and might be allowed to live in tranquillity and peace in their small factories.²

¹ *Letters from Fort St. George, 1711*, page 11.

² “While your Excellency lay with your army at Ginjee, I understand you were pleased to issue out your Purwanna for securing to us our privileges at Tevenapatam (Fort St. David). Upon my arrival here I found that place (Fort St. David) in trouble; Serōpe Singh having seized some of the English there and carried them prisoners to Ginjee, on occasion of some disgust given him by a former Governor. We are but a small handful of people, and our business is trade; and, therefore, all quarrels with the Government is extremely prejudicial to us, and destroys the end for which we settle in these parts. Since my coming I have laboured all I could to compose this difference, but to my great trouble, it hath hitherto proved ineffectual. If this war comes to be represented at Court, no doubt but Serōpe Singh’s agents will do it as much to our disadvantage as they can. I, therefore, humbly beg of your Excellency, that if any complaint be made against us on this subject that you will be pleased to excuse the matter, and that we desire nothing more than to live in tranquillity and peace in our small Factories. And if your Excellency would be pleased to procure us His Majesty’s Hosbulhocum to Serōpe Singh, to let us live in quiet and mind our trade, it will be a singular service to your petitioner, and which he shall always retain a grateful sense of.”

The prospects of peace seemed to be in sight by 11th September 1711, as we find from a letter of the same date. "We have a better prospect of peace than ever and only wait for a letter from Gingee to know what the terms are."¹ A letter of 27th September 1711, speaks of the prisoners having been freed from irons in their prison at Gingee. Moreover, there had been no further skirmishes after that in which Captain Coventry fell. "Our prisoners are out of irons which looks as if the enemy were inclined to peace. We have had no further skirmishes ever since the action of Coventry and Somerville."²

When terms of peace were offered by Sarūp Singh and forwarded to Fort St. David, the Council at that settlement submitted to Governor Harrison and the Fort St. George Council these conditions, with their own remark that they were so much in excess of the renters' dues. Governor Harrison made very justifiable remarks in comment on the whole course of affairs, passing severe strictures upon the conduct of the subordinate council.

"It is most certainly true that Sarūp Singh could not before in justice demand more of us than the Renters' debt, and not

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1771*, page 89.

² *Ibid*, page 98.

that neither because Mr. Roberts was their security when they run away, not the Company; but the destruction of fifty or sixty thousand pagodas worth of grain, about fifty-two villages and towns, among which was his favourite town Yembollum, and killing the Pandarrum; these are things which really make his demands carry too much justice with them; and we heartily wish the differences may be composed, and so happily settled as before the commencement of this war. Without your permission though to disburse something considerable out of the Company's cash, we shall not ask it till we find an absolute necessity."

"We (the Governor and Council of Fort St. George) cannot but observe with a great deal of concern the unaccountable folly and ill management of these gentlemen through the whole course of this affair; but most particularly in this article. For after they had sent out all their forces, without any orders from hence, to burn and destroy all the country and grain round about them, empowered by a single order signed by Mr. Farmer only,—they now as good as tell us in some many words, that the unlawful depredations they have committed really make Sarūp Singh's demands carry too much justice with them; and shamefully confess that they are

afraid they shall be necessitated to ask us to disburse something considerable out of the Company's cash. Mr. Farmer and his then council would have done very well to have considered this inconvenience before they proceeded so rashly on their own heads." ¹

These observations of Governor Harrison show that Sarūp Singh was, on the whole, on the right side, while real injury had been done by the Council of Fort St. David. In the despatch to England of 5th October 1711, we find the same accusation charged on the authorities of Fort St. David. "It is a very different case; the injury being committed on our side, legal satisfaction was not given where it ought."

A letter of November 1711 (*Madras Minutes and Consultations 1711*, pp. 149-150) refers to the money demand of Sarup Singh. He demanded 30,000 chuckrams in return for Pādirikuppam, Tiruvēṇḍipuram and Cōronaṭham, all near the bounds of Cuddalore and renounced all other claims. "That the enemy cannot be brought to more moderate demands than 30,000 chuckrams or 16,600 pagodas. In consideration of which they will give three towns (above mentioned)...that lay within and without our bounds. They likewise agree to

¹ Garstin's *South Arcot Manual*, pp. 40-41.

renounce all claim to our bounds and all pretensions whatsoever with the usual presents of horses and vests." Then the letter refers to the expensive nature of the war costing about 4,000 pagodas a month, besides a quantity of stores and provisions. The inhabitants deserted the bounds and the merchants were not entering into contracts with the company due to the war.

The Council at Fort St. George considered the terms of peace embodied in the letter of November 1711 and found that the amount demanded was totally unreasonable and excessive and began to discuss about the worthwhileness of the purchase of the villages and about the probable revenue which they might yield. They also considered the question of the security of the grant, as they feared that the next governor of Gingee might dispute their title to the places, as Sarūp Singh himself had done now.¹ The state of the war in the Fort St. David area was fully debated at the Fort St. George Council and held to have cost them 4,000 pagodas a month, besides various other bad effects. No rent had been received from the villages since the beginning of the war which became an intolerable charge. They further found that if the war continued many

¹ *Madras Diary of Minutes and Consultations 1711*, page 150.

people would be shut up within the English bounds and grain and provisions would have to be supplied to them and many of the older inhabitants out of fear would also desert them. As a result of these things their trade would suffer. After thinking over the matter, the Fort St. George Council despatched a letter to Raworth, the Deputy Governor, consenting to pay off the renters' debts to the enemy, provided he did not molest them in the possession of the grants he offered. "An entire renunciation of claim of all things within our bounds is a tender point to be handled; for his pretending to claim, after Zūlfikar Khān Bahadur's grant, is an undeniable reason why we should buy no grants of him; since by the same rule the next Governor of Gingee may dispute our title to all we possess, and by the same forcible means may compel us to pay what sum he pleases so that our title will always be precarious."¹

This anxiety for peace on the part of the Fort St. George authorities is best revealed in the letter that they despatched to Raworth. "We are still of the same opinion for a speedy and honourable peace. We agree that Sarūp Singh ought to be made satisfaction for the renters' debt and we should readily agree to

¹ Garstin's *Manual*, page 43.

make Mr. Roberts pay for it, if it were in his power.” The letter further relates that the Company should bear the charges that ought to be borne by its Governor, but they would attach the money belonging to Roberts and debit him for the remainder.

Minor troubles broke out before any peace could be concluded. The letters from Fort St. David relate to several of those troubles. A letter dated February 14, 1712, refers to the fact that all the forces of Gingee had arrived near Cuddalore and proceeded to the Tiruvēṇḍipuram Viṣṇu pagōḍa, where they laboured, by means of offerings and oracles, to secure the blessings of the deity in their ventures against the Fort St. David forces. Having got no encouragement they returned dissatisfied.¹ Some other minor engagements were also reported to have taken place. A force marched from Baṇḍipālayam near Tiruppāpuliur, when the commanding officers of the English garrison met them. They retreated, with the loss of four men, to a small village which they had built for their shelter. Another scuffle took place between Baṇḍipālayam and Tiruppāpuliur where a sergeant and twenty men advanced against them and killed six and wounded several. They retired with

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1712, page 28.*

great precipitation and never gave trouble any more.

Peace made in May 1712

On the 10th of March 1712, the Fort St. David Council received a letter from Mon. Hēbert, Governor of Pondicherry, who very civilly offered his services as a mediator to bring this ruinous war to a close. A cessation of hostilities was agreed upon and Mr. Benyon was sent to Pondicherry to act conjointly with Raworth during the negotiations and give him proper instructions.¹

A letter of May 8, 1712, refers to a small break-down in the peace negotiations. The letter was from Hēbert, who stated that his hope of the conclusion of peace was on the point of being shattered when he promised to give something more, that what Mr. Benyon said he was empowered to do. The treaty was signed on May 5, 1712, at a cost of 12,000 pagodas to the Company, though it only meant 1,000 pagodas more than what Benyon was prepared to give. The enemy promised to keep quiet and stop all hostilities, and to send back the prisoners.²

¹ *Madras Diary of Minutes and Consultations, 1712*, pp. 42-43.

² *Letters to Fort St. George, 1712*, page 78.

**Articles of the treaty that was signed by the
Fort St. David Government and Sarūp Singh**

The following articles of the treaty are from from the Fort St. David Consultations of May, 1712.

Article 1. The Raja of Gingee shall grant to the English Company for ever, Tiruvēṇḍipuram and its neighbouring area, which included Pādirikuppam and Cōrunaṭham, together with other lands granted to them by Rāmarāja and since confirmed by Zūlfikar Khān.

Article 2. The Raja of Gingee shall make over the renters' debt to the English Company.

Article 3. The English prisoners must be immediately released and delivered into the hands of the mediator, while the English shall deliver theirs into their custody when the treaty is signed.

Article 4. The Raja of Gingee shall make a present to the English Company and a *teshariff* to the value of 1,000 pagodas to be deducted from 11,000 pagodas.

Article 5. There should be freedom of trade and merchandise in the Gingee country.

Article 6. The peace should be lasting and durable and all past troubles ought to be forgotten.

Article 7. Anyone who violated the treaty obligations should suffer the consequences.

Thus the long-desired peace was at last secured by the mediation of Hēbert, the French Governor of Pondicherry.

After the treaty

A letter of May 5, 1712¹ refers to the daily expectation of the return of the released prisoners from Gingee under Raworth, who hoped that the conclusion of peace would enable the country to enjoy tranquillity and peace and there would be no more interruption of cultivation and trade by such troubles. Another letter of May 26² refers to the fact that Mr. Benyon had written that the prisoners were delivered at Pondicherry and that the articles had come down from Gingee signed by Sarūp Singh according to agreement.

A letter of 30th April 1715³ says that Benyon paid the expenses at Pondicherry during Hēbert's mediation with Sarūp Singh's people who were a numerous body. Hebert

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1712*, page 81.

² *Ibid*, p. 92.

³ *Despatches to England 1714-1718*, page 81.

got nothing from it, but a horse and vestments as a reward for his exertions.

Causes that hastened the treaty.

The operations against Sarūp Singh had been tedious and expensive. From the Directors' despatch from England which signified the approval of the terms of the peace arrived at, we get an idea of the losses caused by the war. "We have considered the war relating to Gingee, and the terms of peace along with the reasons for making it. Though the peace had cost us 12,000 pagodas, we are glad it is well over at last, for besides that money, it hath been a prodigious charge for us, as well in the continued expenses which has increased to 5,000 pagodas a month and in the entire loss of the revenues of the villages, the hindrance of investment, besides the dubious events of the war. We believe you did your best in the whole affair including the negotiations."¹

The war had been very injurious to the investment and trade of the Company. We have already seen that, in the discussions that took place at Fort St. George on the proposals for peace, the authorities were convinced of the impossibility of protracting the war for

¹ *Despatches from England 1713-14*, pp. 16-17.

various reasons. "They found that several stores and provisions had been wasted and no rent had been received from the villages. Moreover, the villagers had to be supplied grain and other necessities, being shut up in the bounds during the war. Many inhabitants threatened to desert them and merchants who had made a contract could never trade."

Moreover the depraved conduct of the soldiers and the disorders within their ranks had urged the necessity for a treaty. The despatch to England reveals the following information:—"Not fear of ourselves but the preservation of the settlement was the only inducement to pay so much money for the fomented peace." In another portion of the above despatch are noted "the good consequences of peace and the consequent flourishing of the place." The English were thus very much concerned in maintaining the peace of the land in their own interest.¹

¹ "We expect good will ensue from the war so that the natives here and elsewhere shall have a due impression on their minds of the English courage to maintain against so potent a prince, as the Raja of Gingee." A letter from Fort St. David, dated July 1716, refers to the hardships of the renters during the war. "The bound renter had petitioned to the English Government at Fort St. David with his list of grievances. He had purchased a *cowle* from Roberts, the then Deputy Governor, who had to pay the prince for the war for which he was responsible. The *cowle* was granted for four years at 5,000 chuckrams per annum which he paid regularly for

The losses for Sarūp Singh.

Sarūp Singh also suffered severe losses during the war, owing to the plunder of several of his villages by the troops of Captain Roach in the Valudāvur and Gingee districts. He had suffered losses equally and perhaps more, due to these damages. A letter to Fort St. George dated 4th September 1711¹ refers to the extra-ordinary charges he had been at to carry on the war. “Besides the damage done to his country had so impoverished him that he could not pay his troops. He was forced to give them leave to plunder for subsistence, which they daily do with the utmost severity.”

The power of Sarūp Singh.

Sarūp Singh was spoken of in the English records as a potent prince. A letter says:— “We expect that goodwill may prevail among the natives, that they had shown great courage against so potent a prince as the Raja of Gingee.” Another describes him as “a considerable prince and a Rajaput too. This

the first two and a half years, after which the wars with Sarūp Singh caused him great losses and hence (he) could not pay and the debts to the Company rose to 600 pagodas.”

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1711, page 85.*

Mughal's mother was of that family.”¹ The Directors, while regretting the vast expenses of the war, wrote as follows:—“You have been misinformed about the Raja of Gingee's power and strength and we cannot imagine why he should not have dared to seize our people in Pitt's time. We are opinion that Mr. Fraser's wrong notion of the power of Sarūp Singh, encouraged him to let things go so far as they did. The present Raja is a tributary to the Mughal and has a considerable revenue with which he maintains a strong force.”²

Sarūp Singh's death 1714 A.D.

After the peace was signed on May 5, 1712, tranquillity prevailed in the land and no more troubles arose between the English and the Gingee ruler. A letter of January 1714 sent to England refers to the death of Sarūp Singh. “We have only to add that the country round about is peaceable and quiet. Sarūp Singh, the Raja of Gingee, being lately dead and a new Governor is expected to succeed him.”³

A later letter of July 1714 says that the Gingee government was embroiled by the

¹ *Despatches to England 1711-1714*, para 87, page 7.

² *Ibid*, pp. 58-59.

³ *Despatches to England 1714-1718*, page 5, para 29.

death of Raja Sarūp Singh and that the rest of the country was also full of troubles.”¹

Sarūp Singh probably died by the end of 1713 or in the beginning of January 1714. He was advanced in age when he died, for we read in a letter as early as 5th September 1711, wherein he is described “as having grown infirm and that it is with great difficulty and very slowly he despatches any business.” There prevailed a rumour that even in 1711 he was retired and that his son was to succeed him, “which will make the matter worse, he being a person of youth and activity.” Another letter of the same year referred to the prevailing dissatisfaction with the administration of Sarūp Singh and the consequent rumour that a new governor was on his way to Gingee. Want of money forced him into permitting his troops to plunder the neighbouring districts, including those under Abdul Nabi Khān and Sādatuḷḷāh Khān himself. Porto Novo which had been given to the former was taken forcible possession of by the troopers of Sarūp Singh who was anxious to get the peace concluded with the English before he expected to be superseded.² The

¹ *Idid*, para 29.

² Letter of Raworth to the Madras Council, dated 11th September 1711:— “The Army continue plundering the Diwan's country and lately burnt one of his towns

matter of his accumulating arrears to the Padshah who ordered rigorous measures for their recovery reached his ears; and there-upon he became "sorrow-stricken and falling ill, died sometime after." Hence it is possible that Sarūp Singh died at an advanced age towards the end of 1713.

called Parsimungalam after having extorted two thousand pagodas from the inhabitants besides which they have taken possession of Porto Novo which is lately given to Abdul Nabi. These actions will undoubtedly exasperate both those Nawabs against them, if Sarūp regin is continued, but last night we were informed as a certain truth that he was out and a new king on his way to Chingee, and that he has written to Mōbet Khān to get a small matter, if he cannot assume, of consequence from us, rather than leave the accommodation to his successor, but we fear this is too good news too be true. It is most undoubtedly fact that three hundred foot and sixty horse have left the service for want of pay, and that the rest is very much dissatisfied for the same reason so that all reports put together, we think we have a better prospect of peace than ever, and only wait for a letter from Chingee to know on what terms they are."

CHAPTER IX

The Period of Bundela Rule (2)

RAJA DESING OF GINGEE

(His Ten Months of Rule).

(January 1714—3rd October 1714).

We have to depend largely upon what we can gather from an examination of the Tamil ballad and the Mack. Mss.¹ for a clear account of the short rule of Raja Desing. The Madras records that give so much information for the rule of Sarūp Singh, his father, do not reveal much about his son, Raja Desing. Probably the very short period of his rule is the cause of the lack of reliable material about him.

¹ The following is the account of Narayana Pillai, as translated by the learned Diwan Bahadur Dr. S. K. Aiyangar, in the *Journal of Indian History*, Vol. IX pp. 15-21. The account seems to be on the whole marked by clarity and by a certain amount of proper sequence. Of course, Narayana Pillai was a native of Gingee and knew, more correctly perhaps than any other writer, of the affairs of this part of the Carnatic. As mentioned above in the course of this book, the Tamil of Narayana Pillai was a sort of brogue, "a sort of hybrid between bazaar Tamil and the official Hindustani written Tamil." Narayana Pillai does not show himself a partisan of Desing, but on the other hand was more inclined to justify the attitude and conduct of Nawab Sadatullah Khan. "The narrative presented of Desing probably conveys all the correct history known of the hero and his short ten months' rule of Gingee." Bejew is given the account taken from the translation :

"News of the illness of Sarup Singh reached the house of Sarup Singh in Bundelkhand. Desing (Tej

Singh), the son of Sarup Singh, immediately started with his wife and fifty horse and attendants, and arrived at Bidanur (Bednur) in the Karnatak. At that time the Raja of Bidanur was much troubled by the Mahratta sardars between whom and himself frequent skirmishes were taking place. Having heard of Raja Desing's arrival, the Raja of Bidanur urged the friendship of Desing's father, Sarup Singh, the *killēdār* of Gingee, and persuaded Desing to render him assistance, by showing him letters received from Sarup Singh. After due consideration of the proposal, and on the representation of the chief officials of Bidanur who carried the letter, Raja Desing agreed to assist the Raja of Bidanur and attacked his enemies with his own forces. His contingent distinguished itself and succeeded in turning back the assailants. The Raja of Bidanur in return paid one lakh of rupees and made him a present, with great pleasure, of an extraordinarily good horse in his stables, which nobody had been able to ride before. The animal actually cost him twelve thousand rupees. Having heard the description of the horse, Desing proceeded to the stables and found the animal tame at his approach. Desing was able to ride the animal without any trouble and thus secured the present for himself in addition to money, dress and jewels. With all these, he arrived at Gingee. Sarup Singh had died in the meanwhile, while Desing was still on the way from Bundelkhand to Bidanur. Reaching Gingee, Desing performed the funeral ceremonies of his father and assumed authority as the *killēdār*. The *killēdāri* officials of Sarup Singh paid *nazar* and acknowledged him as his successor; while the Padshahi officials, such as the *dhainath*, the *vaknavis* and others did not pay the usual *nazar*. Knowing that Desing was a man of quick temper, nobody dared to intimate to him that he should not assume office without the orders of the *Sarkar*. Payya Ramakrishna, the *vaknavis*, however, found a suitable opportunity some time afterwards to point out that he should assume office only with the knowledge of the *Sarkar* and with the orders of the Padshah where necessary. Failing this, he urged that he ought to obtain orders from Nawab Sadatullah Khan.

“Desing replied that his father Sarup Singh got the *miras* of Gingee from his Padshah, Alamgir, and

therefore he was not bound to apply to anybody else, and nobody's orders were therefore required. Payya Ramakrishna kept quiet and six months passed.

“Sadatullah Khan had information of the death of Sarup Singh. But he did not send anybody to take possession of the government of Gingee. He wrote to Raja Desing, however, a letter of condolence on the death of his father. Desing was exercising his authority over all the taluks of Sarup Singh's *jaghir*. In the meanwhile, there arrived from the Padshah two *harkars* to Arcot (the head-quarters of the Carnatic *subah* since the days of Daud Khan) carrying a *farman* to Sadatullah Khan, and orders to Sarup Singh (the orders that Farrukh Siyar issued in regard to the seventy lakhs of revenue due). Having read the *farman* from the Padshah, Nawab Sadatullah Khan called the *sheristadar* of the Padshahi, Lala Todar Mall (*Tamil* Tondar Mall), and told him that Raja Desing was an irritable young man and therefore (he was) to proceed personally to Gingee and show him the *takid farman* and the letter from himself and take possession of the fortress quietly and peacefully, as well as the *jaghir* lands attached thereto, and to send down Raja Desing. Todar Mall left Arcot at the head of fifty horse and the necessary equipage and, reaching Gingee, encamped himself near the temple of Venkatarama Swami constructed by Mutiyal Nayakan. The Padshahi officials of the fort, Payya Ramakrishna and others, came and visited him in camp. Todar Mall intimated to them that he was the bearer of the imperial *farman* to Nawab Sadatullah Khan and also the *takid farman* to *killedar* Sarup Singh. They examined the *inayatnama* and copies of the *farman* and conveyed the information to Raja Desing. Raja Desing gave them the reply that the fort and also the *jaghir* attached thereto were given to his father by Alamgir Padshah, and that he was not prepared to give up the fort. Payya Ramakrishna in reply said that the *farman* from the Padshah and the *ināyatnāma* of the *Faujdar* were both of them brought to him by the *mutsaddi* who was encamped in Gingee. Whatever Raja Desing might have to say in this matter, he ought to speak to him. He pointed out that Todar Mall was a good man, as also was the *Faujdar*, Sadatullah Khan. They assured him that they would not take away the entire *miras* from him, but that, if he saw

Todar Mall and the *Faujdar* afterwards, they would confirm him in the *killedari*. Payya Ramakrishna therefore impressed it upon him that he ought to go and see Todar Mall. Agreeing to this, Raja Desing at the head of his horse and all the necessary equipage of his father, went out riding towards the cremation ground of the Rajas near Melacheri. Turning round from there to the temple of Chakraperumal on the bank of the river and turning towards the fort from there, the Raja came to the tent of Todar Mall. Todar Mall, seeing that the *killedar* was coming, went forward to meet him. Desing made his salutation, but without getting down from his horse. Todar Mall felt chagrined and returned to his tent. Desing proceeded on his way to the fort. The next morning, Todar Mall in his turn came on horseback and reached the court of Desing. Being a mild man, Todar Mall felt that he should not make much of the 'characteristic stupidity of the *Bundela*.' He approached Desing in due form and presented him the imperial *farman* and the *Faujdar's inayatnama*. When Desing got them read out to him, his eyes turned red and, becoming angry, he said that he would not allow his *jaghir* to be taken possession of by Todar Mall. But if he persisted, it would result in the rolling of many heads. So saying, he threw down the *farman* of the Padshah and the *inayatnama* of the *Faujdar* towards Todar Mall. Todar Mall took up the documents and returned to his camp. The *faujdari* officials followed him to the camp and wanted orders as to how they should conduct themselves. Todar Mall instructed them to go on as ever before in the discharge of their various duties and sent them back.

Todar Mall reported to Nawab Sadat-ullah Khan, the *Faujdar* of the Carnatic, that, if an attempt be made to take forcible possession of the fort, there was likely to be a fight for its possession, and pointed out that Raja Desing's confidence in the line of conduct that he had adopted was due to his possession of 350 horse of his own and 500 soldiers belonging to his *killa*. On receipt of this letter the *Faujdar* set his army in motion and a review took place in the plains of Timiri. In the course of a month, the *faujdari* forces rose to 5,000 horse and ten thousand foot, besides contingents from Bangaru Yachamanayaka of Venkatagiri, from the Nayak of Kalahasti, from the Poligars, Bommaraja and other *killedars*, the whole

army totalling thirty thousand. The *Faujdar*, having collected all the necessary material for carrying the campaign to the uttermost, arrived at Arni. He was met there by the *killedar* of Arni, Venkat Rao. Presenting the usual *nazar* and paying the *peshkash*, he joined the Nawab with his contingent. After fifteen days' stay, the Nawab broke up his camp and reached Chetput, the *kill*a of Salabat Khan who met him and made the payments due. He was in camp there for about ten days when Todar Mall joined him. In Gingee, however, Payya Ramakrishna, the *vaknavis*, and the other officials of the *faujdar*i, pointed out to Raja Desing that the *Faujdar* was in full march, with his own army and auxiliary contingents, upon Gingee, that the *Faujdar* was authorised to exercise control over all the *killedars*, *jaghirdars* and Rajas of all the Carnatic and was authorized to receive tribute from them. 'Your father was given a *takid farman* for possession of Gingee. It would not do for you to disregard all these, and to persist in the course of hostility adopted by you. Even now if you would visit the *Faujdar* and pay your respects to him, he would recommend to the head-quarters and obtain the *killedari* for you. The *Faujdar* is actually seen at the head of a large force. It is for you to judge on the basis of these facts and adopt a line of action conducive to your interests.' Raja Desing gave no answer to this remonstrance. The Nawab's forces encamped at Kadalimalai and entered the territory dependent on Gingee and set about plundering. The army gradually entered Gingee. The forces of the *killedari* did not oppose the *faujdar*'s forces. Seeing this, Raja Desing wrote to his friend, the *killedar* of Valudavur, which belonged to the estate of his father, and obtained from him the assistance of his son Mohabat Khan and two of his friends at the head of fifty horse. On the arrival of these, Desing got ready and mounted his horse. Those that were well inclined towards him, pointed out to him that the omens were bad and that it was not proper that he should advance against the *Faujdar*'s forces. Declining the advice given, Desing went to his wife and told her that, in case he should not return, she ought to find means to protect her honour. He sent word to all concerned that the army of the Muhammadans was approaching, and, advising those dependent upon him not to

follow if they did not care, he set forward at the head of his guard on the road to Arcot. He was followed by 200 horse and by Mohabat Khan. Without taking notice any of the Nawab's forces that met them, he reached the banks of Varahanadi, which was in full flood, as it was the month of *Arppisi*. After waiting there for just a short while, he spurred his horse into the flood, followed by Mohabat Khan and about a hundred horse, and reached the further bank of the river. The remainder of the force stood on the nearer bank alone. The river was not deep, and, even when it was in floods, it would be possible for them to cross it by waiting a few hours. But Desing had no consideration for these and marched forward at the head of his hundred horse against the Nawab's forces. Information of this having reached the *Faujdar*, he sent forward Daulat Khan at the head of a contingent with instruction to fight him and capture him alive, and himself got ready and mounted his elephant. Daulat Khan, seeing Desing's approach at the head of a slender force of about a hundred horse, ordered his forces to spread out and surround the small body coming against him, himself advancing with a view to capture Desing. Desing and Mohabat Khan attacked Daulat Khan's forces, and fought for some time vigorously till their troops lost fifty men each. Of the followers of Desing a few fled. Mohabat Khan and his two friends stuck close to Desing and remained with him. They fought hard killing a number of the enemy, till they themselves were killed in their turn. Desing, now left alone, was in terrible anger and wished to kill Daulat Khan who was on his elephant. Daulat Khan cried out to his troops not to kill Desing, but to capture him alive as that was the order of the *Faujdar*. So saying, he urged forward his elephant and made an effort to capture Raja Desing. Finding an opportunity in the course of manœuvring, Desing spurred his horse, which got on to the side of Daulat Khan's elephant and rearing on its hind-legs, set its fore-legs on the flank of the animal. Desing simultaneously pierced Daulat Khan with his lance and turning round, quickly galloped towards Gingee. Even after the death of Daulat Khan, the *Nawab-Faujdar* still urged the soldiers to secure Desing alive and not to kill him, and moved forward on his own elephant. One of the men on the side of the elephant

cut off the fore-legs of Desing's charging horse. The horse fell and Desing became a footman. Even after this the Nawab would not well permit his men to kill him and wanted that he should be captured alive. He urged his elephant forward and brought it near Desing. He was followed closely by Bangaru Yachamanayaka on his own elephant similarly urging his men to capture Desing. One of the jamadars of this Nayak, holding his shield in front as a protection, approached Desing with a view to capture him. Desing transfixing him with his spear, when Yachamanayaka ordered that he be struck down. One of the sepoys that was ready with his gun loaded and the burning wick lighted the fuse; and he was dead. The Nawab entered the fort carrying the dead body of Desing with him in the year Jaya, month Arpisi, date 2, corresponding to Fasli 1123, about an hour after sunrise (Sunday, 3rd October, 1714 O.S.).

The Nawab entered Gingee and proceeded to the fort of Nazaratghad in Padshahbagh, and, having seated himself in the *Kalyanamahal* of the late Sarup Singh, saw that the treasury and other places were secured and put under seal. All the officials of the Padshahi, the officers of the army that followed him, other amirs and rajas and the officials of the Nawab saluted the *Faujdar* and presented him *nazar*. In the fort itself, the Nawab secured the *Baratkhana*, the *Chowkipara* and other places, and sent word to the wife of Raja Desing and others in the palace, of his assumption of the government of the fort. Desing's wife sent back word that the Nawab was her father, and that she had no wish to continue to live after the death of her husband, and requested permission to become *sati* by ascending his funeral pyre. Finding her immovable in her resolution, the Nawab ordered everything to be provided for carrying out her wishes, and gave her the permission she sought. The cremation of the body of Desing and the immolation of his wife took place the next morning on the bank of the tank dug by Ram Shetty in the days of Rajaram. The funeral ceremonies were performed by the son of Alup Singh, a nephew of Raja Desing, at the expense of the Nawab's treasury. The followers of Desing, the Nawab ordered, were to continue to hold their places and remain as before. They, however, obtained the permission of the Nawab to raise a new town at the spot near Kadalimalai, where

Few readers have not heard of the gallantry of the young Rajput ruler of Gingee, who took up an attitude of remarkable and reckless defiance towards Sādatullah Khān, the Nawab of Arcot.

The *Ballad of Raja Desing*¹ is a folk-song of South India. It deals with the life and exploits of Raja Desing in a miraculous vein. Writing in his "Folk Songs of Southern India," Charles E. Gover says:—'The sepoy of the British Army are fond of singing the exploits of a certain Raja of Gingee.'

The ballad refers to one Tēraṇi Singh, who is regarded as the father of Dēsing, and to Taraṇi Singh, his younger brother. More-

Desing fell, and, were given a *cowle* therefor, and they built at the spot a temple to Desing. They also built tombs for Mohabat Khan and the other Muhammadans who fell, as well as one to the horse of Desing. They recovered the corpses of Mohabat Khan and his two friends, and after burying them in the outskirts of Gingee, built tombs over them on the bank of the Shetty's tank. They raised a flower-garden where Desing was burnt and planted in the place a *pipal* and a *murgosa*. The Bundelas that were in the service of Desing obtained permission and returned to Bundelkhand.

¹ Dēsing is spelt variously as Jeyasingh in the Mack. Collection, Desing by Taylor in his *Catalogue Raisonné*, Tēj Singh in Sewell's *List of Antiquities*, and Tajab Singh in Burhanuddin's *History of the Carnatic and Kurnool*. Desing is probably the Tamil corruption of Tēj Singh. The popular spelling is only Desing. The Despatches to England of the year 1714 (page 45) give the spelling, Taygy Singh.

over, it has given a reference to Sura Singh as the father of Taraṇi Singh. According to the records of Fort St. George, Desing should have succeeded to the governorship of Gingee on the death of Sarūp Singh. In a despatch to England of January 1714, a reference is made to the death of Sarūp Singh and to the person who was expected to succeed him.¹ Another despatch to England refers to the death of Sarūp Singh and says that the administration remained under the care of his son, Tāygy Singh, till the beginning of October last.² A letter to Fort St. George of 4th September 1711 already quoted, referred to the infirmity of Sarūp Singh and to a report that he was removed presently from rule and that his son, who was as a man of vigour and activity was to succeed him.³ Probably, even by September 1711, Dēsing had marked himself out for boldness and courage which he later on displayed so recklessly against Sadatullah Khan. Another letter of 11th September 1711 also refers to an unconfirmed report of the successor of Sarūp Singh.

An interesting reference to the probable existence of more sons than one to Sarūp Singh is given in one of the Madras despatches

¹ *Despatches to England, 1711-1714*, page 191.

² do. 1714-1718, pp. 45-46.

³ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1711*, page 85.

to England which says :—" The Mughal having been displeased with the attitude of Hassan Ali seizing Gingee, ordered one of Sarūp Singh's sons to be restored to his father's government." ¹ No other record has been available to tell us of the probability of there having been more sons than one to Sarūp Singh.

We have already seen that the power of Sarūp Singh was so great that he had shown remarkable strength and independence in his quarrels with the Fort St. David Council and that he had evaded the payment of tribute due to the Emperor, the arrears amounting to nearly 70 lakhs according to the *Tamil Chronicle* (Mack. Mass.).

According to the ballad, Desing was born at Gingee while his father was the governor of the place. It gives a vivid description of the Gingee country and the prosperity of its inhabitants under the rule of Sarūp Singh and dwells on the joy that the people displayed at the birth of Dēsing at Gingee. It narrates that his father, Terani Singh, had left for Hindustan on being summoned by the Emperor, who had invited all his tributaries to try their strength in taming a wonderful

¹ *Despatches to England, 1714-18, page 80.*

horse that he had accidentally acquired. The father left for Delhi, leaving behind him at Gingee his pregnant wife, who shortly afterwards gave birth to the child, Desing, during his absence. The ballad then gives a highly embellished description of the wonderful horse which Desing got from the Emperor of Delhi as the reward for taming it and consequently saved his father from imprisonment and the penalty of a fine. Desing is spoken of as a raw youth when he achieved this wonderful feat.

In the Madras records of 4th September 1711,¹ the prince is referred to as a man of youth and activity. Desing is said to have been only 8 years old when his father died in Gingee. He then came under the tutelage of his uncle, Taraṇi Singh, who is said to have ruled Gingee for some years till the coming of age of Desing!

According to the account of the chronicler, Narayana Pillai, who might have had first-hand information about Sarūp Singh and Desing from persons that might have actually lived at Gingee in their days—the chronicler, it may be remarked, was a native of Gingee itself—Desing happened to be in Bundelkhand

¹ *Letters to Fort St. George, 1711, page 85.*

at the time of the death of his father; and his going over to Gingee, on his father's demise, with an escort and his taking possession of the *killēdāri* formed the beginning of his quarrel with Nawab Sadatullah.

We read that as soon as the news of Sarūp Singh's death reached his ancestral home in Bundelkhand, Desing at once started with his newly married wife and fifty horse and attendants and arrived at Bednūr,¹ in the west of the Mysore plateau. The Raja of Bednur was then at war with the Marathas. He had solicited the help of Desing through Sarūp Singh, his father. The Raja of Bednur succeeded in pushing back a Maratha raid with the help of Desing, who was given as a present a high-mettled horse, besides other valuable gifts. Probably this horse was the one that showed such wonderful valour during the battle with Sadatullah Khan, the Nawab of Arcot. With this present Desing arrived at Gingee.

¹ The chiefs of Bednur then controlled Mangalore, Kalyanpur and Basrur; and in 1713-14, they were fighting with the Portuguese and the Arabs who harried their ports and plundered the ships sailing from the Canara Coast. By this time the Dutch had succeeded in establishing a factory at Basrur; and shortly afterwards Raja Somasekhara Nayak advanced to Nilesvar on the south. A similar episode of Chanda Sahib, on being released from his Maratha prison, tarrying at Bednur to help its ruler in 1748-49, can be noted.

From Narayanan's *Chronicle* we learn that Desing started for Gingee from Bundelkhand only on hearing of the death of his father. If that were so, he would have gone directly to Gingee to perform the obsequies. He would not have deviated from his course and halted at Bednur to render help to the Raja. Probably the news of his father's death was conveyed from Bundelkhand to Bednur where Desing was then rendering aid to its ruler.

On arriving at Gingee, Desing performed the funeral obsequies of his father before assuming the government of Gingee. A *farman* had been granted to his father by Aurangzib and Desing took formal possession of his father's jaghir on ground of hereditary right. We do not know whether the *farman* gave any claims to the grantee in perpetuity or a hereditary right to the grantee's heirs. The Nawab of Arcot who attempted to dispossess Desing, pleaded that the *farman* was not valid without the sanction of the reigning Emperor.

Desing did not receive a warm welcome from the Mughal officers in the country. Payya Ramakrishna who was the *vaknavis* (or the secretary), had informed him, however, of the legal necessity of getting the

farman renewed by the new Emperor, before assuming the *jaghir*. Desing replied that he had got the *farman* of Aurangzib and that he need not apply to anybody else.¹

Sādatullah Khān, who had been the Nawab of Arcot for some years even in the life-time of Sarūp Singh and who had reported to the Emperor about the arrears of tribute due from him, sent, in his capacity as the Nawab, a conventional letter of condolence to Desing on the death of his father.

Causes of the struggle between Sadatullah Khan and Desing

Sarūp Singh when he affected indifference to the Nawab's demands for arrears, had failed to pay any tribute at all, taking advantage of the frequent changes in the *nizamat* of Arcot and of the general weakness of the Mughal administration in the whole province. Under Farrukh Siyar, the demand for the payment of arrears was vigorously pressed; but Sarūp Singh contrived to evade payment and died with the arrears accumulating. Hence the demand was again renewed on this occa-

¹ *Despatches to England 1714-1718*, pp. 45-46. "The king had granted to his father, the Gingee government and that by his father's death is devolved upon him and that he would not deliver it up."

sion and thus arose the quarrels that ended with the death of the young Rajput.

The *Chronicle* of Narayanan affirms that two officers from the Emperor came to Arcot, the headquarters of the *faujdari* of the Carnatic, with the demand for 70 lakhs of arrears from the *killēdāri* of Gingee. The Nawab of Arcot summoned Todarmal, the *sheristadar*, and asked him to proceed to Gingee and enforce the imperial *farman* and his order for the confiscation of Gingee with all the *jaghir* lands attached to it. Todarmal left Arcot with a grand equipage, but with a troubled mind, as he had heard of the valour and prowess of Desing. He encamped in Gingee near the Venkataramana-swami temple at the foot of the Rajagiri Hill. The Mughal officials of the district visited him in his camp. Tōdarmal intimated to them that he had come under the orders of the Nawab to demand the arrears and to take possession of Gingee. They examined the *farman* and conveyed the substance of it to Raja Desing. Desing was not prepared to give up the fort and maintained his title to it and to the *killēdāri* on the basis of the imperial *farman* granted to his father. The ballad says that he was worshipping his tutelary diety, Ranganatha, when the news of the approach of Todarmal was conveyed to him and that he continued in his worship undismayed by the news. Raja

Desing was advised to meet Todarmal and get from him the confirmation of the *killēdāri* by making due submission.

Raja Desing then proceeded with a number of horsemen to meet Tōdarmal at Mēlachēri (or old Gingee) and saluted him without getting down from his horse. Todarmal felt that he was insulted by such behaviour and immediately returned to his tent. Later, he got over the feeling of humiliation, returned to the fort and handed over the *farman* to Desing who became highly irritated and threw down the paper on the ground. This action constituted an act of *lese majestē* and was held to be a measure of positive disloyalty.

On hearing of the report of Todarmal of his treatment by Desing, the Nawab of Arcot resolved to march on Gingee, at the head of a great force to meet the Rajput.¹ Kumara Yāchama Nayak of Venkatagiri, who had been installed after the death of his father by Zūlfikar Khan, helped the Nawab of Arcot with a contingent of troops. Several other chiefs and some *killēdārs* helped the Nawab whose army was thereby augmented to 30,000 men. The troops encamped at Arni after

¹ *Minutes and Consultations, 1714*, page 120. A letter of 18th September 1714, from Fort St. David relates to the Nawab's march to Gingee.

their first stage of march and its *killēdār* joined with another contingent of troops. Then the army was further augmented at Chetpet by another *killēdār*; and along with Todarmal the Nawab reached Gingee. One, Khan Sahib of Kallakurichi, also joined the army of the Nawab.¹ The ballad says that the army halted at Dēvanur village in the neighbourhood and plundered the place. Dēsing was informed of the fact; and being undaunted he applied for help to the *killēdār* of Valudāvur, who had already proved a good ally to Sarūp Singh in the quarrel with the English. It says that Mohabat Khan was so good a friend of Desing that he started immediately to his help, while in the very act of celebrating his own marriage. Mohabat Khan is referred to in the ballad as a son of the *killēdār* of Valudāvur. It is probable that he might be different from the one of the same name who had fought on the side of Sarūp Singh in the latter's quarrels with the Fort St. David Government. Anyhow, Mohabat Khan and two other friends stood loyally by Desing and fought like the *Three Hundred of Leonidas* in the fight. The forces of the Nawab were considerable, while those of Desing were very slender. Desing's army consisted of 350 horse and 500 troopers while

¹ *South Arcot Gazetteer*, Vol. I, page 329.

the Nawab's army had 80,00 horse-men and 10,000 sepoy.

The *Chronicle* of Narayanan says that Todārmal tried to conciliate the Rajput chief and to avoid a war. Nawab Sādatullah Khan is referred to in the ballad as one who was peace-loving and who wished as far as possible to avoid hostilities. But Desing, being a hot-blooded youth, refused to be conciliated and wished to fight out the case. He was only 22 years old at the time; and he very manfully took leave of his young wife before going forth.

Payya Ramakrishna and other officials of the *faujdāri*, pointed out to Desing the strength of the Nawab's forces. They also explained to him the folly of resisting the Nawab. They tried hard to bring about a reconciliation between him and the Nawab; but Desing would not agree to any sort of compromise. Unmindful of the slender forces at his command and aided by his trusted friend Mohabat Khan, he resolved to oppose Sādatullah Khan.

The ballad also refers to the bad omens that were seen when he started out for the fight. In spite of the refusal of permission by his tutelary deity, Ranganatha of Singavaram, who is miraculously said to have turned his

face away from the devotee when he invoked his blessings, he got the reluctant consent of his young wife and received *pānsupāri* from her through the curtain. Then he set out bravely for the fight.

The Fight

Desing started bravely and reached the bank of the Varahanadhi (Sankarāparaṇi of the ballad) which was then in full flood. He crossed the river in flood. The Nawab had instructed his troopers that Desing was to be captured alive and brought to him. In the course of the battle many of Desing's followers fled, while Mohabat Khan and a few friends fought by his side to the last. In an attempt to capture Desing alive; Daulat Khan, a captain of the Nawab's forces, was killed. The Nawab persisted in ordering that Desing should not be killed, but captured alive; and in that order he was supported by Bangaru Yāchama Nayaka.* When Desing attempted to pierce with his lance an officer of Yāchama Nayak, the latter ordered that Desing should be shot dead. He was shot down at Kadalimalai, a village four miles from Gingee. The Nawab then entered the fort with the dead body of

* This was Sarvagna Kumāra Yāchama, son of Bangaru Yāchama, killed by Zūlfikar Khan, who came into the chiefship in 1695 A.D., and was the 23rd of his line.

Desing borne respectfully (*Jaya, Arpisi*, date, 2; Fasli 1123; about an hour after sunrise is the date mentioned in the *Chronicle*, i.e., 3rd October 1714).

A representation of the battle sculptured on a stone slab has been preserved in the Madras Museum. A Persian inscription of *Hijra* 1125 (57 of 1905) refers to the capture of the fort by Sādatullah Khan in 1712-1713 A.D. The translation of the contents of the inscription is as follows:—"The exalted Khān Sādatullah Khān, upon whom be multiplied the blessing of Haidar, captured the fort of Jinji by the favours of the incomparable Almighty. Ghulām Alī devised the date for it. "Islam expelled infidelity" 1125 Hijra (1712-1713 A.D.).¹ The dating of the inscription does not accord with the actual date of the battle, i.e., 3rd October 1714, as 1125 A.H. only extended from January 17, 1713 to January 6, 1714. That year could not have been the date of the battle, for Sarūp Singh was then the ruler of Gingee according to the Madras Records.

A letter, from the Fort St. David Council, of October 9, 1714, refers to the battle of Gingee. "The Nawab had drawn all his forces

¹ *S. J. Epigraphist's Report for 1904—5. Part I, p. 3.*

round Gingee and summoned Sarūp Singh's son to surrender, on pretence of an order from court to take possession of the place which he refused to do and made a desperate sally with about 300 Rajputs and was very near killing the Nawab, having cut the harness of his elephant with his own hands, but timely succours coming to the Nawab's rescue, Teja Sing, Sarūp Singh's son, with Mohabat Khan and several other prominent men of Gingee, were overpowered and cut off so that it is believed that Gingee will surrender in a few days."¹ On the 15th of November news came that Gingee was captured by Sādatullah Khan.² The same is referred to in a despatch to England thus:—"After the great skirmish the great fort, that formerly held out against Asad Khān and the whole army, being left without a head, immediately surrendered to the Nawab, who had made it his head-quarters and his fortifying and strengthening it as if he intended to become its master, though everybody believed that he undertook the expedition on a pretence without an order from the court."³ A letter from Delhi, from Sir John Surman, dated August 4, 1715, refers to the capture of the fort by force and the "victory being on the king's

¹ *Minutes and Consultations, 1714*, page 126.

² *Ibid.* p. 142.

³ *Despatches to England, 1714—18*, pp. 45-46.

behalf has very much pleased this court." The same letter says that "concerning Sādatullah Khan's victory we have examined and found that as the news arrived in court that Raja Sarūp Singh is dead, orders were sent from hence to deliver up that fort to Sādatullah Khan."¹ A letter of July 17, 1715 sent from Madras to Bengal says that the Nawab had taken the strong fort of Gingee.²

According to the Madras Records³, the French at Pondicherry had sent to the Nawab a congratulatory present on his capture of Gingee of about 1,200 pagodas, along with other articles on account of the several villages they possessed under the government of Gingee. The English sent only a congratulatory letter to the Nawab instead of a money present according to the custom of the land; a letter of January 1715 has stated "that no money should be parted as an acknowledgment of the government of Gingee for our title to the bounds of Fort St. David, which would be made use of as an established custom and every succeeding Governor would ask upon the same account."⁴ But from a later letter (of October 1715) we learn that the present in-

¹ *Minutes and Consultations, 1715*, page 135.

² *Ibid.*, 122.

³ *Despatches to England, 1714—18*, pp. 45-46.

⁴ *Minutes and Consultations, 1715*, page 35.

tended last year upon the Nawab's taking Gingee which was postponed, was forwarded with some addition on account of the villages in Fort St. David undisturbed.¹ By the 15th November 1714, a small present by way of congratulation upon his success at Gingee to the Nawab was decided to be sent so that things might be easy at Cuddalore and to avoid any dispute with him which would disturb the trade in cloth.² Even before this, a letter from Fort St. David had shown that the Nawab of Arcot was inclined to give trouble to Cuddalore and the adjacent territory belonging to the Gingee jaghir.³

According to the *Chronicle*, the Nawab Sādatullah Khan then entered Gingee and proceeded to the fort of Nasrat Gaddah (Gingee) in the *Padusha Bagh*, seated himself in the *Kalyana Mahal* of the late Sarūp Singh, secured the safety of the treasury and sealed them. All the officials of the Mughal administration paid their homage to him. In the fort itself the Nawab secured the *Baratkhana*, the *Chōwkipara*, and other places and sent word to the wife of Raja Desing about the capture of the fort. The Rajput queen in accordance with her custom wished to commit *sati*

¹ *Ibid*, 122.

² *Ibid*, 1714, 142.

³ do. do. 131.

as a true wife; and the Nawab ordered that her wishes should be respectfully carried out.

The cremation of the body of Desing and that of his wife is said to have taken place on the bank of the tank dug by one Rama Chetti, in the days of Raja Ram, and hence known as Chettikulam. Even now the villagers of Gingee point out the spot between Chakrakulam and Chettikulam, where Desing is said to have been burnt. The funeral ceremonies were performed by one Alup Singh, a nephew of Sarup Singh.

The followers of Desing were continued in their offices; and they also secured permission to raise a new town at the spot, near Kadalaimalai, where Desing fell and also a temple in his honour. The Nawab, out of respect for the memory of Dēsing's wife, built a town near Arcot and called it *Rāni-Pēttai*. Tombs were also allowed to be built for Mohabat Khan and other leaders who fell in the battle. A flower-garden was also reared at the place, where Desing was burnt. Now we find no such garden, nor even any vestige of it. The town built where Desing fell, was given the name of Fateh-pēt. We now see in Gingee reminiscences of the heroic Rajput lady, in the Rani's bathing-stone and other objects that are found near the fort, though in a ruined condition.

According to Narayanan, the Nawab is said to have taken charge, from Dēsing's officers, Hanmāji Pandit, Tiruvēnkatam Pillai and others, of their offices and accounts, and sent them out as *amils* of dependent *parganas*. He settled the rents and taxes after measurements and granted *cowlenama* to the inhabitants of the *petta*. He appointed Sādat Tiyyār Khan, his wife's sister's husband, as the *killēdar*, along with a suitable *mansab* and a *jaghir* for his support.

A *jumma masjid* was built within the fort, which can be seen even now, along with an *idga* in front of the Chettikulam tank. It is deemed in the Mss. to have been such a splendid structure, the like of which is not likely to be seen anywhere.

Diwan Lāla Dakhin Rōy built a single-storied mansion for himself with a beautiful garden around it. The date of the capture of Gi Gēe was cut out on a stone and built on the porch of the gate of victory in Rajagiri.

In this manner Sādatullah Khan carried on the administration of the Carnatic for four years, with Gingee as his chief residence. We have seen already that, according to a despatch to England of 1714, Sādatullah Khan made Gingee his head-quarters, fortifying and strengthening it as if he would stay

permanently there.¹ At the end of four years, *i.e.*, in 1718, he handed over the fort to his deputy and returned to Arcot.

An Estimate of Raja Desing.

Quite a striking trait in Desing's character was his sense of true comradeship with Mohabat Khan, who had been his companion from childhood. Contempt of death was a maxim of life with the hero which he was never tired of repeating (*Ballad of Desing*). It was in the blood of Desing to court all dangers and fight against the worst possible odds. The gallantry displayed by Desing at the young age of 22, against the powerful Nawab Sādatullah Khān of Arcot, in a struggle that was hopeless from the outset, should make us remember him for ever. Whatever might be said of the morality or the correctness of the war for which he fought, his undaunted courage and independence, displayed in his fight with Sādatullah Khan, was remarkable. According to the Madras Records already quoted, we found that the Nawab used, as a pretext, the Emperor's order to seize Gingee from Desing. The Tamil *Ballad* and the *Mackenzie Chronicle* both refer to the Emperor's order which was held as the basis for Sādatullah Khan's march against Gingee. Anyhow, the Rajput was so independent-minded that he did not like to give up his father's *jaghir* obtained on the basis of Aurangzib's

¹ *Despatches to England 1714—1718*, pp. 45-46, and *Madras Diary of Minutes and Consulations 1914*, page 141: for the Nawab's designs to reside at Gingee see letter from Fort St. David.

farman. He fought to the last, bravely aided by his trusted friend. The young wife who committed *sati* on the death of her husband, deserves our sympathy and admiration for her fortitude that was characteristic of her race.

Thus the Rajput episode in the fortunes of Gingee ended with the display of remarkable, but futile, gallantry by a hot-blooded young Rajput and his virtuous and Stoic-minded wife.

CHAPTER X

Gingee under the Nawabs of Arcot and the European Powers

I. The Rule of the Nawabs

A

The fortress of Gingee lost its pre-eminent position within a few years of the extinction of the Rajput rule. The increasing unhealthiness of the locality necessitated the removal of the headquarters of the Mughal *subah* to Arcot, situated on the south bank of the Palar River. Though Gingee was reduced in status to a *killédári* and lost much of its political importance, it continued to attract the attention of adventurers.

According to the *Tamil Chronicle*, Nawab Sādatullah appointed his brother-in-law (the husband of his sister-in-law) Sādat Tiyyār Khan to be the *naib-killēdar* of Gingee and gave him the dignity of a *mansab* and a *jaghir*. He bestowed the *faujdári* on one Padanda Rayar and named the town founded on the spot where Desing was killed as *Fatehpet* (i.e., the Town of Victory). According to *mámúl*, he retained in his service Payya Ramakrishna and the other chief officers of the *Pādshāhi* and also appointed other ser-

vants, *killēdars*, *muftis* and *sardars* for the three forts of Gingee, namely, Rajagiri, Krishnagiri and Chandràyandrug. He appointed Gautama Venkatapathi to be in civil charge of Krishnagiri and gave him, according to convention, the *jāghir* of Penñàtur. He entrusted the charge of the lower fortress at the foot of Rajagiri to another Mussalman officer and enjoined upon all the duty of obedience to the orders of Sādat Tiyyār Khan, Abdul Karīm Hayat Khan and their associates; and they were charged with the guarding of the *killē-dāri*. Over all the officials, Sādat Tiyyār Khan made himself supreme. Muhammad Ali, son-in-law of Shaikh Abdul Khadir, the *kazi* of the *Padshahi*, was appointed to be the *kazi* of the *killā*. A *jumma musjid* was built inside the lower fort and an *idgah* was raised facing the bund of the tank of Chettikulam. An inscription was engraved over the porch of the great entrance-gate of the fortress indicating the day and year of the capture of Gingee by the Nawab.

The Nawab found in course of time that the water of Gingee was not healthy and would not agree with his constitution; and he ¹ therefore retired to Arcot after making over charge of the *killā* to his *naib*.

¹ Nawab Sādatullah Khan, originally named Muhammad Sayyid, was left by Daud Khan to be his

diwān and *faujdār* in 1708. According to the *Sa'adat Nāma*, a Persian history of his house, he received the appointment as the Nawab of the two Carnatics in 1713 from Nizamu'l-Mulk, immediately after the accession of Farrukh Siyar.

Sādatullah Khan was the regular and acknowledged Nawab of the Carnatic (1710 to 1732 A.D.). According to the *Māsirul-Umāra*, he held the Nawabship from the time of Aurangzib to 1732. He died much regretted by his subjects. Sa'adatullah succeeded Daud Khan and was confirmed by the Nizam in 1723.

The rule of Nawab Sādatullah Khan is thus praised in the *Tuzak-i-Walajahi*, Part I, P. 68. (Translated by Dr. S. M. H. Nainar, 1934):—"Now it is in the power of God to raise an ant to the rank of Sulayman and defeat human wisdom. The raising of a beggar to the position of a sultan, which seems not to stand to reason, is worked out in the unseen *darbar* of the Almighty. As days rolled, on Muhammad Sa'id, from the position of a servant, found his entry into the group of *mansabdārs*. With the title of Sa'adatullah Khan, he accompanied Dawud Khan, and was appointed to the post of Diwan. Thus, he grew prosperous day by day. In the subah of Arcot, he was for twenty years *Naib* to the Nāzim and for five years *Nāzim*. The fame of his administration was sung for twenty-five years on the whole. He devoted his high purpose to the welfare of the creation and to the organisation of his army. He was a follower of the Twelve Imams, and had faith in the sect of Ja'far. He had in his heart the interests of his relatives and the members of his family. He invited them from Konkan and bestowed on them *jagirs* and forts. His younger brother Ghulam Ali who was at the court of the Padshah, was granted the *jagir* of Vellore and given the title of *Khān*. He tried to comfort and console the poor, the orphan and the needy. The people regarded his days as the best of the past, and were of one accord in praising the justice of his *nizāmat*. He had no issue and so adopted one of the sons of his uncle and named him 'Khan Bahadur.' Then, the *nāzim* of his soul (*ruh*) left the *nizāmat* (of the kingdom) of his borrowed body. All his nobles divided themselves into two groups; one chose the side of Khan Bahadur, the other that of Baqir Ali Khan, the Qil'adar of Vellore, the son of Ghulam

Sādatullah Khan's rule was not all quiet at Gingee. In 1724 there was a bloody strife for the possession of Gingee between Sādat Tiyār Khan and Abdul Nabī Khan. The latter was wounded mortally and the former killed. Sadatullah marched to the place, but met with strong opposition, as the followers of Abdul Nabi Khan were determined to maintain their right to the fort.*

In 1725 the great Nizam'l Mulk Asaf Jah who had established his virtual independence in the Deccan in the previous year, directed Iwaz Khan to proceed towards the Carnatic and clear the country of Maratha agents and raiders who had penetrated into it. Iwaz Khan drove out the Maratha tax-collectors from several places and replaced them by his own men. He marched against Trichinopoly and Raja Sarfoji of Tanjore. The rule of Vijaya-ranga Chockanatha, the Nayak of Madura and Trichinopoly (1706–1732), was one unbroken record of the decline of the kingdom towards disruption and ruin. Raja Sarfoji appealed to Maharaja Shahu of Satara who sent a large army under Fateh Singh Bhonsle

Ali Khan, the brother of the deceased Nawab. After great discussions and many arguments Baqir Ali Khan, was appointed as the successor to the throne of the *nizāmat* of Arcot."

* *Madras Minutes and Consultations for 1725* (pp. 85 & 92.)

to whom he had given a special interest in the *chauth* of the Carnatic. Along with Fateh Singh Bhonsle, went Baji Rao, the Peshwa, and Sripat Rao, the *Pratinidhi*; the Marathas exacted tribute in their usual manner from the chiefs of Gadag, Bednore and Srirangapatnam in the western plateau. There was not much harmony among the commanders of the Maratha army; Fateh Singh was indifferent to his soldiers, and the *Pratinidhi* was spiteful against the Peshwa; and on the whole, the Maratha losses in this campaign were heavy. The Nizam craftily won the goodwill of the *Pratinidhi* and offered him a *jāghir* in Berar and Maharaja Shahu approved this arrangement. As the next step in his attempt to thwart the Marathas, the Nizam affected ignorance of the respective claims of Shahu and his cousin to the Maratha throne itself and withheld, pending their final settlement, the *chauth* and *sardēshmukhi* due from the six Mughal Deccan provinces under him; and he even got over to his side the rival prince, Sambhaji. But in spite of all these he could not resist Shahu's power and had finally to submit to the treaty of Mungi Shevgaon in March 1728.

As told above, the first expedition of the Marathas into South India under Fateh Singh Bhonsle proved a failure. A second expedi-

tion was undertaken soon after, under Fateh Singh, which was helped by Raja Tukoji which also likewise ended in nothing.¹

¹ In order to understand the interference of the Marathas in this epoch in the affairs of the Carnatic, it is necessary for us to know that besides the kingdom of Tanjore which the younger branch of the Bhonsle line had acquired, the Ghorepades were established at Gooty and other Maratha chiefs held outposts on the fringes of the Carnatic, at Belgaum, Koppal, Sandur, Bellary, Sira, Bangalore and Kolar. Maharaja Shahu had given Fateh Singh Bhonsle the *jāghir* of Akalkot so that he might keep an eye on the affairs of the Carnatic. The Chhatrapati, Maharaja Shahu, was animated by a desire to annex the Carnatic to his *Swarajya*, according to the conditions of the treaty of 1718 as ratified by the Emperor. Muhammadan sway had been only recently established in the heart of the Carnatic. And there was the Rajah of Tanjore, Tukoji, who could be easily brought over to help him in the project. It was in consequence of this desire that the two expeditions of Fateh Singh Bhonsle noted above were undertaken between 1725 and 1727. The first was known as the Chitaldurg expedition and the second as the Seringapatam one. Neither could penetrate into heart of the Carnatic proper. Fateh Singh was asked by Shahu as to why he did not stay long enough in the Carnatic to make an effective conquest of it.

The Nizam transferred his capital from Aurangabad to Hyderabad in 1726 in order that he might be nearer the Carnatic and Mysore countries and might check more effectively the predatory incursions of the Marathas into these regions. He could also contrive to keep his movements from Hyderabad concealed from the court of Satara more effectively. It was now that he tried to placate the *Pratinidhi* and accentuated the division between the latter and the Peishwa and fanned the growing flame of jealousy entertained by Prince Sambhaji against Shahu, through the instrumentality of Chandra Sen Jadhav, who was a sworn enemy of Shahu and the Peshwa. "The Nizam promised his help to Sambhaji and instigated him to claim half of the *Swarajya* from

In the end of 1726 the Nizam began open warfare against Shahu. Then came the campaign which ended in the victory of Palkhed and the treaty of Mungi Shevgaon. The significance of this treaty was great. It averted civil war in Maharashtra, strengthened the position of Shahū against his rival and made Baji Rao supreme in the councils of Shahu. It was in the course of these years that the Nizam is said to have marched to the *subah* of Nawab Sādatullah Khan.

The account given by Narayanan, in his *Chronicle*, of the coming of the Nizam is as follows :—Nizamul Mulk, Nizam u'Daula, Asaf Jah, Fateh Singh Bahadur, Vazir of the Deccan, in the reign of Muhammad Shah Bahadur, left Delhi and stopped at Hyderabad and started from there to recover the tribute of the Carnatic. He descended with his troops to the north of the Palar near the town founded by Dakkana Roy, the Diwan, and addressed a *farmān* to the Nawab Sādat Ullah Khan, to the kings and killedars of the Carnatic asking them to come and see him

Shahu. While he was openly championing the cause of Sambhaji, he gave out with a show of reason that until the claims of the two princes were definitely settled, it would be unfair on his part to pay the *chauth* and *sardēshmukhi* to Shahu and his officers. After this the Nizam showed himself in true colours, and it came as a shock to Shahu." (Sinha : *Rise of the Peishwas*, Part I, p. 84).

with the accounts of receipts and charges and those of the expenses of the officers.

As soon as he read this *farmān*, Sādat Ullah Khan sent for the *gumasta* (head accountant) Nandi Krishnaji Pandit and ordered him to prepare all the accounts, especially those of the *jaghirs* and *killas*, and to carry them next morning to the camp of the Nawab. He intimated the same order to the Diwan, Rupa Chand, brother of the late Dakkana Roy. Krishnaji Pandit replied to him that he kept ready all the accounts.

The next morning the Nawab Sādat Ullah Khan proceeded to the camp of the Nawab, with all his suit and accompanied by the *diwan*, the *sheristadar*, the *kanakku gumasta* (accountant) and the *muftis*. It was only the day after their arrival that the Nawab Sādat Ullah and the *muftis* could see Nawab Asaf Jah and submit *nazars* to him.

Full of regard and kindness for Sādat Ullah Khan, the *Faujdar* of the Carnatic, Nawab Asaf Jah told him to take a seat near his own. Sādat Ullah Khan salaamed to him and sat down. Asaf Jah made enquiries about the health of Sādat Ullah Khan and complained about the unsatisfactory state of the accounts of the *jaghirs* of the Carnatic. The *diwan* did not know what to reply.

But Krishnāji Pandit submitted papers and read therefrom the accounts of the jaghirs of the *killēdari*, the balances to be recovered and the expenses incurred by the subordinate officials of the government; in short, all the details of the accounts were enumerated and queries were answered in a satisfactory manner. Greatly satisfied with the conduct of the *Faujdār* of the Carnatic, and his officials, the Nawab Asaf Jah gave him valuable concessions. For his part, the Nawab Sadat Ullah Khan gave him five lakhs of rupees by way of present and of *peshkash* and Rs. 100,000 for the expenses of the *darbar* to the subordinate employees who accompanied him. Nawab Asaf Jah Bahadur stayed with the *Faujdār* for 10 days.¹ Then after having taken leave of the *Faujdār*, he returned up valley.

¹ It is a difficult matter for us to be sure of the exact date of Nizamul Mulk's first visit to the Carnatic in the life-time of Nawab Sādatullah Khan. 1721 was the only year, besides 1742, in which the Nizam marched into the Carnatic. We have a Maratha newsletter (No. 8 in the *Selections from the Peshwa Daftar* No. 10: *Early Strife between Bajirao and the Nizam*) which has been attempted to be dated February 1721, and in which we are told that the Nizam had marched into the Karnatak and was then at Savanur in the neighbourhood of Darwar and Bednore. Perhaps, soon after this, in the summer of 1721, the Nizam paid a visit to the court of Sadatullah and settled the affairs of the Carnatic and its jaghirs.

It is here that we read from our Chronicler that Asaf Jah conferred upon the Nawab a *killat* of honour, *sarpech* and other insignia of rank as an expression of his regard and kindness; he returned by way of the passes into the Mysore plateau through Sira from whose *subahdar* the *peshkash* due from the poligars of the neighbourhood was duly collected.

We now hear of an episode, the escape of a prince of the Mughal imperial family from the fortress of Agra with a large quantity of precious stones which he sold at Calcutta to a Seth in return for a *hundi* for 50 lakhs of rupees on Tirupati. He proceeded to Tirupati and from thence came to Rajagarh (Rajagiri) and took shelter here. From this place he issued a circular letter to all *faujdars* and Nawabs from the great Asaf Jah downwards, ordering them to proceed to his camp on a certain date. Sādatullah Khan cleverly wrote to the Emperor Muhammad Shah and received a reply from him that he should watch over the person of the prince; he brought him to Arcot where he got him married to the daughter of a nobleman. He wrote of all these happenings to the Emperor Muhammad Shah and according to the latter's instructions, transferred him and his newly-wedded wife to Gingee and allowed him to occupy the palace of Kalyanamahal in the lower fort, that was

built by the late Sarup Singh. Sādat Tiyaṛ Khan, the *naib killēdar* of Gingee, was asked to pay his respects to the prince every day and to keep him in good spirits. Every alternate year for the remainder of his rule, Nawab Sādatullah Khan stayed for some days at Gingee in the house of the *killēdar* and paid his respects to the Prince. There were then 54 killas under the *subah* of the Carnatic. To many of these Nawab Sādatullah appointed his own men and all his actions were ratified by Nawab Asaf Jah and confirmed by the imperial court.

As he was a fervent Musalman, Sādatullah Khan appointed only men of his own faith to the charge of the *killas* and treated them with great regard. Under his *faujdāri* many *jaghirs* were granted in the region of Gingee and some of these were made free of all payments. Our Chronicler Narayanan says that it was under his rule that the English constructed a fort at Madras and that when he was informed of this fact, Nawab Asaf Jah sent to the *Faujdar* an order to stop the construction of this fort. But as the *Faujdar* was favourable (good to the English) he did not stop the construction.¹

¹ Madras experienced several troubles from Nawab Sādatullah Khan. In the time of Governor Harrison (1711-17) troubles arose over the possession of the Five

New Villages which had been granted by Nawab Daud Khan to the English in 1708. These were Tiruvottiyur, Nungambakam, Vyasarpadi, Kathiwakam and Sattangadu. A permanent grant of these villages was included as one of the provisions of the *farman* issued by Emperor Farrukh Siyar to the English in 1717 on the representation of the embassy of John Surman. Even at the time of their grant, Sādatullah Khan who was then the Diwan of the Subah of Arcot, had objected to the confirmation. He subsequently claimed the restoration of the five villages on the ground of the legal insufficiency of the grant; and also pressed for the rendition of the three old villages already granted; *viz.*, Egmore, Purasawakam and Tondiarpet; and he actually resumed possession of the five villages in 1711. The demand for the three old villages was not pressed by him as the matter was amicably arranged through the good offices of Sunka Rama, the Company's chief merchant, who conducted prolonged negotiations. In 1717 Surman obtained from Delhi three separate *farmans* confirming the English privileges in the three presidencies and the Madras *farman* included the return of the five villages which had been resumed by the Muhammadans.

A second great achievement of Harrison was an extensive reconstruction of buildings in the fort. The bastions and curtains of the Inner Citadel were demolished and a new building known as the Fort Square was erected in their place.

In the time of Governor Collet, the local Mughal officials contrived to put off the return of the Five New Villages; and though they were first occupied by the English, Sādatullah Khan sent his troops to expel them and there was an open fight between the latter and the English at Tiruvottiyur. Nawab Sādatullah was not discouraged by the rebuff that his troops received in this fight and put forward a haughty demand in 1721-22 for the restoration of these villages on the ground that they formed part of the *jaghur* of his overlord the Nizam. Governor Elwick held that he had the *farman* of the Mughal Emperor himself for these villages and pointed out that the Nawab himself had acknowledged the English right to them in the past. An embassy was sent to the Nawab who had come down to

Nawab Sādatullah organised all the *killas* of the Payenghat region of the Carnatic and of the *khalsa* lands.¹ He had no issue and adopted a son of his uncle and named him Khan Bahadur. He died in the year, Ananda, 1144 Fasli. He had secured from the Emperor the dignity and rank of a *panch hazāri mansab*

San Thome; and Rayasam Papaiya and Sunka Rama, the English envoys, who went over to the Nawab's camp, were forcibly detained. But when Elwick roundly charged the Nawab with an abuse of his power, the latter gave in; and no further difficulty was raised about the villages.

In the time of Governor Macrae (1725-30) the fortifications and buildings of White Town were strengthened, and the ramparts of the Old Black Town were repaired, the Egmore Redoubt was strengthened and a new powder factory was erected in the island. It is these fortifications that should have been objected to by the Nizam and that were passively permitted by the Nawab Sadatullah. (C. S. Srinivasachari: *History of the City of Madras*, pp. 122 and 131 et seq.)

¹ Among these were the seven *killas* of Gingee, Kalavay Gadh, Giddangal, Perumukkal, Valudāvūr, Vriddhāchalam, Pālayamkōttai, Ranjangudi, Kūnjagadi, Pōlur, Mustafagadh or Sankarapuram, Vēpūr Durgam, Rāvuttanallur, Chidambaram, Tiruvannamalai, Elavānāsūr, Karnatakghadh, Pennattūr, Timmappayan Durgam, Mallikarjungadh, Arni, Chetpet, Chingleput, Karunguzhi, Poonamallee, Mylapore (San Thome), Tirupāssur, Tamarapakkam, Timiri, Arcot, Vellore Durgam and Kottai, Vandavasi, Kailasgadh, Padaividu, Vannāndurgam, Chakkilidurgam, Vajendragadh, Āmbur Gadh, Satgadh, Chittoor, Maye Mandalam, Avalkondai, Chandragiri, Udayagiri, Rampur, Satyavedu, Chekku, Devagadh, Sulupagadh, Krishnagiri and other forts which constituted the traditional eighty-four *killas* of the Carnatic.

and the ¹ *mahī marātib* and other honours and likewise secured for his nephews (children of his sister-in-law) *mansab* ranks. There were two such nephews, one Safdar Ali Khan, the *killēdar* of Karunguzhi, and the other, Muhammad Sayyid Khan, Khan Bahadur. After his death all his nobles divided themselves into two hostile factions; one of them took the side of Khan Bahadur and the other that of Baqir Ali Khan, the *killēdar* of Vellore and the son of Ghulam Ali Khan, the brother of the late Nawab. After much negotiation, Baqir Ali was raised to the *nizāmat* of Arcot over the heads of Safdar Ali and Khan Bahadur, as they were judged unworthy to succeed. Baqir Ali, soon after he ascended the *nizāmat*, gave up his position to his younger brother, Ali Dōst Khan, and retired to the fort of Vellore. Ali Dōst thus became the Nawab in succession to Nawab Sādatullah. Ali Dōst Khan's rule was good; but it was weak and encouraged turbulence and insubordination on the part of the nobles and the *killēdars*.

¹ *Māhī Marātib*. (The dignity of the fish)—The privilege of having carried before a man of rank, the representation of a fish or part of it, of metal gilt, borne upon a pole, with two circular gilt balls similarly elevated, conferred as a mark of distinction by the Emperor of Delhi on personages of the highest rank. One of the latest, or perhaps the last, conferment of this rank was to Lord Lake by the Emperor Shah Alam in 1803.

During the administration of Ali Dōst Khan, Sayyid Muhammad Khan of Tadpatri was put in charge of the fortress of Gingee. He ruled with the help of a body of 300 horse and many followers and relations of his. There arose a fierce dispute between the Hindus and the Mussalmans over the murder of a Hindu *ṣanyāsi* by some *faqirs*. The Mussalmans, out of sympathy for the *faqirs*, got the support of Sayyid Muhammad Khan and resisted the execution of justice on the culprits, as ordered by the *killēdar*, Sādat Tiyyār Khan. The whole matter was converted into a political question; all the civil officials from the *diwan* of the *faujdari* downwards declared themselves on the side of the Hindus to whom justice was due, and even the *faujdār* had to send a letter ordering the delivery to the Hindus of the guilty *faqirs*. But Sayyid Muhammad Khan and his party refused to obey the order and made themselves ready for a civil struggle, which was imminent for a time, between the Mussalmans ranged on one side and the Hindus including the officials and the Rajputs, on the other. The sequel however, as plaintively described by our Chronicler, was against the Hindus. He thus writes pathetically: "But the government belonged to the Mussalmans. The cause of the Hindus failed. The *killēdar* made many promises. Fatalists by nature and considering that the dead do not return, the

Hindus interred the body of Dakkanatha (the murdered *ṣanyāśī*) at the spot where he had performed *tapas* and erected a building thereon where they assembled some monks to whom they gave 15 *kānis* of rent-free land. During the time of the Mussalmans many iniquities were thus committed with impunity.”

Nawab Dōst Ali acquired a reputation for moderation and justice. As Burhanu'd-din remarks: “His kindness was such that his own community could with impunity become his secret opponents, while professing loyalty.” He had one son, named Safdar Ali Khan, and five sons-in-law; of the latter the third was the famous adventurer, Chanda Sahib; and the first was Ghulam Murtaza Ali Khan, son of Baqir Ali Khan; and yet another, Taqi Ali Khan, was the *killēdar* of Wandiwash. In 1734 Safdar Ali and Chanda Sahib who was an ambitious and scheming adventurer, were sent on a roving commission to the south; and during this campaign they captured Tanjore by storm and placed it for the time in the hands of Bade Sahib, the brother of Chanda Sahib.¹

¹ This expedition is not detailed fully by Grant-Duff or Wilks, but has been ascertained from the contemporary news-letters of the Madura Mission. In the Tanjore kingdom, the years 1734-39 constituted a dark era of domestic anarchy, internal dissensions and rebellions of pretenders. The government was dominated by a prominent and infamous Muhammadan adventurer, Saiyad

Khan. Closely connected with this domestic revolution in Tanjore was the rise of Chanda Sahib into great prominence. The Tamil *History of the Karnāṭaka Governors*, attributes this expedition of Safdar Ali and Chanda Sahib to the positive connivance of Rani Minākshi of Madura, who is said to have actually written to Chanda Sahib for assistance. Then followed Chanda Sahib's acquisition of Trichinopoly by treachery; the kingdom of Madura was torn by intense rivalry between Rani Minākshi, the surviving widow of Vijayaranga Chokkanatha Nayak, and Bangāru Tirumala, the father of the boy who had been adopted by the Rani as her son and the successor to the post of Karṭa (Nayak).

The indigenous chronicles, both Tamil and Telugu, are not agreed as to the sequence of events that led to the acquisition of Trichinopoly by Chanda Sahib and the death of Rani Minākshi. Vijayaranga Chokkanatha Nayak (1706-1732) was too pious and religious to keep up his authority undiminished; and on his death in 1732, his wife Minākshi assumed the reins of government and adopted a son from a collateral branch. Bangāru Tirumala, the father of her adopted son, and Dalavay Venkatācharya, formed an alliance to bring about her deposition. When Safdar Ali and Chanda Sahib came to Trichinopoly (1734) Bangāru Tirumala or his ally, made overtures to Safdar Ali, promising to pay him 30 lakhs, if he would take steps to oust the Rani from power. The Rani became alarmed at this prospect, made overtures to Chanda Sahib who had been left behind by Safdar Ali and promised to pay him one crore of rupees, if she should be guaranteed undisturbed possession of the kingdom, stipulating that Chanda Sahib should take an oath on the *Quran* to fulfill his promise. Chanda Sahib was thereupon admitted into the fort of Trichinopoly; and Bangāru Tirumala and his son were quickly sent away to Madura. Chanda Sahib returned to Arcot after these events. The faction opposed to the Rani continued its activities and in 1736 Chanda Sahib had to go a second time to Trichinopoly; and he now proceeded to make himself master of the whole kingdom. He captured Dindigul and Madura; and Bangāru Tirumala fled for protection to the woods of Sivaganga. The disappointed Rani who found herself a prisoner in the hands of the Muslim adventurer, took poison and died. Bangāru

The version of the *Tamil Chronicle* is much more clear, and possibly more reliable as to the course of the intervention of the Muhammadans. It says that when Safdar Ali came down to Trichinopoly in 1734, he was merely anxious to settle the dispute between Bangāru and the Rani and returned after entrusting the implementing of the award to Chanda Sahib. Chanda Sahib's plan was, first, to overthrow Bangāru Tirumala in the name of Rani Mīnākshi, so that there should be no rival to the Rani whom he could easily contrive to set aside subsequently; next, to depose her from rule and to proclaim himself as the governor of Trichinopoly in the name of the Nawab; and finally perhaps to make himself completely independent even of Arcot. Thus Rani Mīnākshi should be utilized for the

Tirumala called in the aid of the Marathas who had an interview with him before they occupied Trichinopoly in 1740. Raghuji Bhonsle, the leader of the expedition, is even said to have directed Murari Rao, one of his lieutenants in the south and governor of Trichinopoly which had been captured, to place Bangāru upon the throne; but no result came out of this. When the Nizam came down to Trichinopoly in 1743, Bangāru bestirred himself and visited him in the hope of obtaining his favour and assistance. Anwaru'd-din is said to have been asked by his master to take kindly care of the Nayak; and the *Pandyan Chronicle* says that the Nayak was poisoned by Anwaru'd-din, when he was residing at Arcot as his pensioner and under his protection. But this looks improbable. The son of Bangāru returned to Sivaganga; and nothing more is heard of him.

destruction of Bangāru Tirumala; then the Nawab's authority should be utilized for the destruction of the Rani; and finally, his independence of Arcot should be built up on the basis of his own prowess. Therefore he returned to Arcot in 1735 in order to get reinforcements and to explain away his plans to the Nawab. He seems to have acquiesced, for the time being, in the plans of the partition of the Nayak kingdom as suggested by Rani Mīnākshi, as a measure of safety. This plan should show that Mīnākshi was clever enough to perceive that the boy-prince should be properly entrusted to the care of Bangāru Tirumala who should be the final defender of the kingdom. Chanda Sahib thought it diplomatic to acquiesce, for the time being, in this arrangement of the Rani.

Raghuji Bhonsle and Fateh Singh now advanced into the Carnatic. As Shahu's objective, *viz.*, an attack on Janjira, was nearly finished, the Maharaja could turn the attention of his lieutenants towards the south (1736). The Peshwa and his brother Chimnaji Appa, had been slowly developing the policy of pushing on Maratha conquests in the south; and Babuji Nayak who had claims on the Karnatak based on the grant of a *mamla* to him, supported the expedition. Shahu himself undertook a campaign in the southern direction; but he did not

go beyond Miraj and returned to Satara, after despatching Fateh Singh and Raghuji Bhonsle towards Arcot and Tanjore. It was during this expedition that Dōst Ali Khan was killed in battle at the foot of the mountains in the pass of Dāmalcheruvu. Dōst Ali had sent word to his son Safdar Ali to hasten from Tanjore where he was then encamped ; but the latter made only a slow march and Dōst Ali had been defeated in the meantime. The Marathas then plundered Arcot and looted its treasures. Soon they advanced against Safdar Ali who, however, contrived to arrive at an understanding with them and persuaded them to turn against Chanda Sahib, of whom he was very jealous. The Maratha army besieged Chanda Sahib in his stronghold of Trichinopoly. The latter sought the help of his younger brother, Badē Sahib, who had been entrusted with authority over Dindigul and Madura. Badē Sahib gathered together his forces carefully, avoided the enemy whose advance troops marched south to resist him, but was defeated and killed at the battle of Koduttalam at a distance of four *kuroh* from Trichinopoly. Thereupon Chanda Sahib “let slip the bridle of firmness from his hand” ; the Marathas got possession of Trichinopoly and entrusted it to their ally, Murari Rao of Gooty, and sent Chanda as a prisoner to Maharashtra. Raghuji Bhonsle, the leader of the expedition, heard in

the midst of this southern campaign news of the successive deaths of Baji Rao Peshwa and of his brave brother, Chimnaji Appa, who were the only persons that could restrain him and of whom therefore he stood in some awe. Being relieved of this fear, Raghuji made himself complete master of the situation, set at naught the authority of both the new Peshwa and his colleague, Fateh Singh Bhonsle, and even encouraged Safdar Ali not to recognise the Peshwa's claims of *chauth* and *sardēshmukhi*. Nawab Safdar Ali, having got rid, for the time being at least, of his rival and brother-in-law, installed himself on the *musnud* at Arcot, received the customary presents from his nobles and feudatories and obtained the *sanad* of his appointment as *faujdār* from Nawab Asaf Jah Bahadur, who was "gratified by humble petitions and presents" and who entrusted the *killēdāris* of Chetpat and Valudavur to Mir Asadullah Khan. It was because of this favour shown to Mir Asad by Nawab Asaf Jah, that Safdar Ali appointed him to be his *diwān*. Nawab Asaf Jah had heard of the courage and intelligence of Safdar Ali and is said to have even arranged for an artist to paint his portrait. The Tamil Chronicler says that "when he had seen it, *i.e.*, the portrait attentively, he was convinced of his bravery," and adds, somewhat cynically, that he "kept his conviction to himself." Safdar Ali how-

ever was generally looked upon as a man of easy disposition and mediocre talents. He had got the confirmation of his office from the Nizam by arranging to pay the latter a sum of 70 lakhs of rupees and had actually paid a considerable portion of this amount before he was assassinated.

Another jealous brother-in-law of his, Murtaza Ali Khan of Vellore, took advantage of the inefficiency and favouritism of Safdar Ali and schemed to set him aside and to usurp the *nizāmat* himself. He also expected that as the Nizam was reported to be secretly hostile to Safdar Ali, there would not be much trouble from that quarter. On the occasion of a visit of Safdar Ali to Vellore, Murtaza Ali contrived, with the help of his own wife, the sister of the Nawab, to poison his food and subsequently, when the poison did not have any effect, to stab him to death. Murtaza Ali actually occupied the *musnud* at Arcot for a few days, but finding that there was a formidable conspiracy brewing against him, returned for the sake of safety to his fortress at Vellore.¹ Some notables of the Subah, including

¹ According to English Records we get the following version. (P.C., vol. lxxii., 27th December 1742, and Succession of the Nabobs in the Carnatic Province since the Year 1710, Orme Mss., (O.V. 25-3) and page 284 of H. D. Love's *Vestiges of Old Madras*, Vol. II).

Hirasat Khan of Satgadh, took charge of the two youthful sons of Safdar Ali Khan, sent a faithful account of the events that had taken place at Vellore and at Arcot, to Nawab Asaf Jah and deplored the forlorn condition of the *faujdāri* of the Carnatic. They also sent a collective request soliciting the *musnud* for the elder of the two sons of Safdar Ali Khan, a boy of ten, by name Sāhibzāda Muhammad Sayyid Khan. On receiving this

“It appeared that Mir Asad, the Dewan, had demanded of the Killedar the portion of the Maratha indemnity in which he was assessed, and the Nawab intimated that his cousin, in default of payment, must resign the fort and jaghire. Murtaza Ali then determined to kill the Nawab, and secure the succession. During the feast of Shab-i-Barat, when leave had been granted to the guards, he executed his villainous purpose, causing Safdar Ali to be murdered in his bed-room, but sparing Mir Asad. Ten days later, he proclaimed himself Nawab at Arcot. The army, however, proved dissatisfied; Morari Rau and the Marathas sided with the family of the murdered man, and Murtaza Ali fled to Vellore disguised in female attire. The army immediately proclaimed Sahib Jadda Nawab under the name of Muhammad Sa'id. Word was sent to Madras, where the boy's elevation was announced with due ceremony at the Garden House, a great procession attending him thither, and back to his residence in Black Town.

“The young Nawab recompensed the Governor and Council for the hospitality shown him by granting them as a gift the five villages of 'Ernavore, Saudian Copang, Vapery, Perambore and Poodupauk, and by the grant of Liberty of Coining Arcot Rupees and Pagodas according to the Usage and Practice of the Country Mints' in a mint to be set up in Chintadripetta. Some minor privileges relating to Chintadripetta were accorded by three other grants of the same date.”

petition, Nawab Asaf Jah proceeded to the Carnatic with a big army. He was advised by Imam Sahib, who was a good friend of Nawab Dōst Ali and had settled at Hyderabad on the latter's death and become one of the Nizam's favourite courtiers, to proceed to the Carnatic. He marched at the head of 80,000 horse and 2,00,000 foot, to strengthen his authority over the Carnatic and to remove the abuses that had crept into its administration. Not merely was the Carnatic in complete disorder, but Himmat Khan, the refractory Pathan Nawab of Kurnool had killed Himmat Tiyyār Khan, son of Alaf Khan Panni, Subahdar of Biāpur and had been persistently withholding his tribute. After settling the affairs of Kurnool, Nawab Asaf Jah proceeded towards Arcot where he received the oath of allegiance from the boy-prince, Muhammad Sayyid. He did not, however, allow the boy to return to Wandiwash to the care of his relations, but entrusted him to the charge of some of his own officers (March 1743) and then proceeded with his army to besiege Trichinopoly and recover it from Maratha hands.

After six months of desultory operations, Nawab Asaf Jah compelled its Maratha governor, Murari Rao Ghorepade, to evacuate the fortress and leave the Carnatic (29th August 1743). He left Khāja Abdullā Khan,

who had already been put in charge of the Subah of Arcot to establish Mughal authority in the neighbourhood of Trichinopoly and himself returned to Arcot. Nizam'l Mulk stayed on in the Carnatic till the end of March 1744; and both the English at Madras and the French at Pondicherry vied with each other to solicit his favour by presents and embassies. The immediate object of the English was to get a confirmation of the right of coining money and of the grants of land made by the boy Nawab at the time of his father's death, when he and his mother were living at Madras under English protection. The Nizam tried to restore peace and order throughout the Carnatic by sending touring officers to reorganise the administration. Through the instrumentality of Khāja Niyamatullah Khan, who was entrusted with the affairs of Arcot by Khaja Abdullah Khan, and Diwan Puran Chand, the revenues of the Carnatic were raised from 35 to 45 lakhs. When Nawab Asaf Jah left Arcot for Hyderabad in April 1744, he formally appointed Khāja Abdullāh Khan as the *nāzim* of the Carnatic Payenghat; but the Khan, after taking leave from his master, died in his bed the very same night. This event was, according to the *Hadigatu'l-Alum* a case of death from excessive joy at the elevation; but rumours prevailed, attributing it to the machinations of

Nawab Anwaru'd-dīn and of the wily Murtaza Ali Khan.¹

Anwaru'd-dīn Khan had distinguished himself in the Nizam's service as well as in that of his father. He was appointed *faujdār* of Ellore and Rajahmundry after the defeat and death of Mubārīz Khan in 1724. He had become conversant with the politics of the Deccan and the Carnatic, having spent about 16 years in that country. According to the Tamil Chronicle, Nawab Asaf Jah, who had taken a liking to the boy-prince, Muhammad Sayyid, and had promised him the office of *faujdār* when he should come of age, now summoned Anwaru'd-dīn Khan and spoke to him thus: "The *faujdari* of the Carnatic is without an incumbent. The son of Safdar Ali Khan is a minor. The country should be governed by you. It is your duty to occupy this office and send by mutual consent with

¹ "In the gathering of the darkness of the night, Khwāja Abdullāh Khan, adorned in the robes of his office, took leave of Nawwab Asaf Jah, met his friends in the happy army, and then reached his tent. There he attended to his affairs, and rested for the night. He rose at dawn, attended to the calls of nature, and sat as usual on the *chawki* (a raised seat) to get ready for the early morning prayer, and performed his ablutions. While he was doing these in the prescribed order, and reached to the washing of his left foot, the feet of his life slipped from the chair of firmness all on a sudden, and he fell on his face in eternal prostration." (*Tuzak-i-Wālājuhi, English Translation*, by Dr. S. M. H. Nainar, Part I, p. 51-52).

this boy, the tribute and land-tax to the treasury of the Nawab." Anwaru'd-dīn Khan was immediately granted the *sanad* and *farmān* for the *nizāmat*, but was instructed to send Hyderabad, as a hostage for his good conduct, his second son, Muhammad Ali Khan (the future Nawab Walajah). Anwaru'd-dīn proceeded to Arcot (April 1744) sat on the *musnud* of the *nizāmat*, received the customary presents and confirmed all the *killēdārs* and other chiefs in their possessions. He showed himself affectionate towards the boy-prince and treated him with every consideration; but his rule was resented by the numerous partisans of the family of Nawab Sādatullah, though Nawab Asaf Jah had made it publicly known that he intended to confer the Nawabship of Arcot on the boy Muhammad Sayyid Khan, as soon as he should attain the age of manhood and had particularly directed Anwaru'd-dīn to educate him and take care of him as his guardian.¹

¹ On the occasion of the Nizam's first entry into Arcot, the mother of Safdar Ali Khan presented herself before the Nawab taking by the hand her grandson Muhammad Sayyid Khan aged 10 years and threw him at the feet of the Nawab. He (the Nawab) took him between his hands and made him sit by his side and consoled the grand-mother, telling her: "Your power is not extinguished; it resides in your grandson. We shall institute as provisional administrator of the Faujdari some one of your friends. When he shall have developed his understanding, this boy will hold the office of Faujdar."

In June, the young boy-prince was killed by an Afghan mercenary under the influence of enemies in a marriage *pandal*. His death aroused the sympathy of the people who generally believed that it was due to the perfidy of Murtaza Ali Khan and his intrigue with the murderers. Anwaru'd-dīn Khān was also suspected of having had a hand in the affair. To clear himself of all suspicions on the part of his master Asaf Jah and to wreak his own vengeance on the murderers, Anwaru'd-dīn dismissed all the Afghan mercenaries from the service of the *nizāmat* and drove away the Pathans from Arcot towards the west to the passes over the Ghais into the interior. He wrote an account of all the happenings to Nawab Asaf Jah and tried to exculpate himself from the charge of having in any way connived at the murder. "Had not his age and service pleaded strongly in his favour, he would certainly have lost his post." But there was no other suitable man for the *nizāmat* at the time ; and after long reflection, Asaf Jah issued an order confirming the Khan in the Nawabship.

The *killēdār* of Gingee, Sādat Tiyyār Khan, died in Fasli 1157 and he was followed in the office by Ghaziuddīn Khan who ruled for five years when he went mad ; and Mir Ghulam Hussain was then appointed to be

the *killēdar* of the fort and given the *jāghir* of Peṇṇātur for his maintenance. He died in a short time, but was not followed in his office by his son, who was given only a stipend. It was also now that the Mughal imperial prince who had been secured in Gingee by Nawab Sādatullah died and was interred at Sirukadambur. There arose great trouble from Periya Aiya, the Bandāri (*poligar*) of Vēttavanam, who, after indulging in a number of skirmishes, was captured and placed in strict confinement in the rock-fort of Gingee under a strong guard. After a few months, with the help of some horsemen who were hiding in the jungle to the west of Rajagiri and by giving narcotics to his warders, he broke from his prison and, escaping from the fort, joined his men. These events occurred in the year 1156, Fasli. Nawab Anwaru'd-din gave over the pālayam of Vēttavanam to the brother of the rebel Bandari and returned to Arcot. He had yet more trouble in the neighbourhood of Gingee in the matter of a quarrel between Muthumalla Reddi, a powerful landholder of Tindivanam and Ananda Ranga Pillai, the well-known Diarist and the influential *courtier* of Dupleix at Pondicherry. This was after La Bourdonnais had captured Madras which greatly worried the Nawab who had definitely ordered both the parties not to indulge in hostilities in the Carnatic. Muham-

mad Mahfūz Khan, the eldest son of the Nawab, was in charge of Conjeevaram; he now allied himself with the French and made war with the English. But he was obliged to fall back. The second son Muhammad Ali favoured the English at Fort St. David and showed himself to be an enemy of the French. Nawab Anwaru'd-din tried to treat both parties on an equal footing.

Muthumalla Reddi of Tindivanam was full of hatred against Ranga Pillai and wrote to the Nawab, inviting him to attack Pondicherry and offering him to pay 1,000 pagodas every day for expenses. The Nawab consequently came with some of his troops to Tindivanam where he stayed for a month. Pondicherry was then being attacked by the English; and the Nawab after receiving some money from the French, made his peace with them; he then advanced south towards Tanjore and Trichinopoly, in order to realize the *pēshkash* amounts due from the vassals in that part of the country.

B

Nawab Asaf Jah died in 1158 Fasli. The news of the death of the aged Nizam reached Arcot 16 days after it happened, which was, according to the Diarist Ranga Pillai, June 2, 1748, (*i.e.* 22nd May O.S.). This news caused great grief both to Anwaru'd-din Khan and to

his son Mahfūz Khan. Nasir Jang who was with his father at the time of his death, set out for Northern India with a great army of horsemen, infantry and gunners and proceeded as far as the Narmada, at the invitation of his brother, Ghaziu'd-dīn Khan of Delhi.

Mutawassil Khan¹, a son-in-law of Asaf Jah, now claimed that the old Nizam had given to his wife the Carnatic and the Subah of Hyderabad. He transferred these rights to his son, Hidāyat Mohiu'd-dīn Khan, Muzaffar Jang, telling him as follows:— “Your grandfather has given me the subah of Hyderabad. Profit by this moment to go to take possession of the Carnatic. The man who knows well the situation of the country is Hussain Dost Khan, also called Chanda Sahib. He is now at Poona, a prisoner of the Mahrattas. I am writing to him and sending for him.” Mutawassil Khan received Chanda Sahib after his release from Maratha hands, gave him robes of honour and sent him with his son into the Carnatic, strongly recommending to the latter that Chanda Sahib should be appointed *fauj-dār* of Arcot, if the country should be conquered by them. Hidāyat Mohiud-dīn Khan

¹ Mutawassil Khan was the governor of Molhair; in 1741 he helped his father-in-law, Nawab Asaf Jah, to put down the rebellion of Nasir Jang who had a narrow escape from death at his hands.

joined Chanda Sahib, took counsel with him, assembled 20,000 horse-men and 50,000 foot and descended into the plain of Kolar in 1159 Fasli. Getting news of this new danger, the old Nawab Anwaru'd-din assembled some troops and munitions of war, asked his son, Muhammad Ali Khan, to come to his help and himself returned from the south country, through Gingee, on his way to Arcot. There he recruited more soldiers to his army and then went to prevent the entry of the enemy into the valley of Arcot from the west ; he was accompanied by Najib Khan and Hussain Khan Tāhir. Raza Ali, son of Chanda Sahib, who was then in Pondicherry and in close friendship with Dupleix, had joined his father with a body of French soldiers and a park of artillery and arrived in the rear of Anwaru'd-din Khan.

After the death of Anwaru'd-din Khan in battle with the enemy at Ambur, Mahfuz Khan who had stayed at Arcot, departed for Hyderabad for safety. Muhammad Ali Khan who had hastened to the plain of Pōlur, retreated to the neighbourhood of Fort St. David and tried through Raja Ananta Das, who was in that fort, to get artillery, ammunition and a body of English soldiers. He then retired to Trichinopoly, where he entrusted Captain Cope with the charge of the *chaukhi* of the fort.

Meanwhile Hidāyat Mohiu'd-dīn and Chanda Sahib reached Arcot in triumph and, after staying there for some time arranging affairs to their satisfaction, marched by way of Gingee to Pondicherry where they stopped for over a month spending their time in festivities and schemes of further victories. It was on this occasion that Muzaffar Jang conferred on Ananda Ranga Pillai the dignity of an Amir of the Carnatic, with the supplementary honours of a palanquin and ornaments and the title of Wazārat Vijaya Ananda Ranga Rao, as well as the charge of the *killēdāri* of Chingleput.

Muzaffar Jang and Chanda Sahib were hard pressed for money which was their primary need and which Dupleix could not supply. Muzaffar himself was not to be greatly relied upon. He and Chanda Sahib now marched on an expedition to Tanjore, after having failed to get any money from the country round Fort St. David and got only very little from Udayār-pālayam. Nasir Jang who had been apprised of these happenings and had begun his march southwards, wrote to Dupleix urging him to separate from his allies, as otherwise he would order all the French factories on the Coromandel coast to be pulled down. He asked Sayyad Lashkar Khan to seize Adoni, Rayachoti and other places belonging to Muz-

affair Jang in the country south of the Krishna. News arrived that early in March 1750 Nasir Jang had reached the Chengama pass; thereupon Chanda Sahib and Muzaffar Jang raised their seige operations at Tanjore and began to retreat across the Coleroon in the direction of Tiruvati. About the middle of March, Nasir Jang's troops occupied Gingee, but the *killēdar* that was appointed to be in its charge allowed the French who were stationed by the enemy at that place to depart with their money and material. Mir Asadullah Khan, the *killēdar* of Chetpat, paid his respects to Nasir Jang when he was encamped in the pass of Chengama and was confirmed in the charge of the districts of Pōḷur, Villupuram and Wandiwash. At the beginning of April, Nasir Jang pitched his camp between Villupuram and Kōliyanur in the direction of Pondicherry. Muhammad Ali joined him with about 6,000 horse and the entire camp extended for about five miles from north to south and three miles from east to west. There was great unrest in the enemy side; and Muzaffar Jang in a fit of depression gave himself up into the hands of his uncle, though he had no preconceived plan of making his own terms with him. Muzaffar Jang's captivity in the camp of Nasir Jang did not seem to have been harsh. In the beginning of May 1750, Nasir Jang was still in the neighbourhood of

Pondicherry and his nobles advised him to forgive Muzaffar Jang. Chanda Sahib was promised Trichinopoly with a mansab jaghir ; but he wanted Arcot as well. ¹ Nasir Jang proceeded from his camp to Arcot where he intended to stay for the rainy season. The sharp division of Nasir Jang's court into two parties, respectively supporting his cause and that of his nephew, is seen more

¹ *A brief survey of the politics and movements of Nasir Jang's army in the summer of 1750.*

Nasir Jang ordered all his troops to rendezvous under the forts of Gingee. About the middle of March 1750 he himself arrived there with the main body. His whole army consisted of 300,000 fighting men, a part of which was composed of cavalry. There were also 1,300 elephants and 800 pieces of cannon. The huge army of the Nizam convinced the English that he was the real *subahdar* of the Deccan ; and they ordered their detachment at Trichinopoly to proceed with Muhammad Ali who had joined with 6,000 horse, the army of Nasir Jang at Valudāvur, situated about fifteen miles from Pondicherry. Some days later, Major Lawrence arrived there with his own body of 600 Europeans.

There were then factions among the officers of the French army who were helping Muzaffar Jang and who were clamouring vigorously for their emoluments. Dupleix had attempted to bring them back to duty by severity, but failed ; and treason increased among the soldiers who became insolent and regardless of their duty.

Soon a cannonade ensued between the two armies. D'Auteuil who was in command of the French army, was desirous of making peace, as he found that he could not rely on his troops with confidence for his success. Moreover, the officers of the army disheartened their men by exaggerating the superior forces of the enemy. However, the cannonade lasted till evening.

Some thirteen officers of D'Auteuil deserted him, and such a scandalous desertion was probably the result of the panic of the troops. D'Auteuil had therefore to withdraw from the field to avoid defeat; and he ordered his men to march towards Pondicherry. Muzaffar Jang and Chanda Sahib were astonished at the unexpected and hasty retreat of the French commander.

Nasir Jang's men then made overtures of peace to Muzaffar Jang and promised him protection on his signing a treaty. Muzaffar Jang had so fully relied on the French troops that he would not lay down his arms easily. But when Chanda Sahib followed the French to Pondicherry, Muzaffar Jang offered himself to surrender to Nasir Jang, relying on the latter's assurances of protection. Nasir Jang swore by the Quran not to make him a prisoner, nor deprive him of his government. Muzaffar Jang was obviously deceived and he was arrested and kept as a prisoner.

The Marathas under Murari Rao pursued the French battalion when they were making the disgraceful retreat to Pondicherry and harrassed them.

Dupleix who was ever undaunted by adversity, soon took advantage of the discontent prevailing among the Pathan Nawabs of Kurnool, Savanore and Cuddapah, as they felt themselves greatly disappointed as to their rewards for services rendered recently to Nasir Jang, and sent a detachment to attack Tiruvati on the Gadilam which fell into his hands easily. Muhammad Ali then marched from Arcot with a huge army of 20,000 men, one half of which were composed of Nasir Jang's troops. He was later joined near Gingee by the English troops. In the battle that ensued between the French and the English forces, the latter suffered a defeat and Muhammad Ali was routed near a place about 8 miles east of Tiruvati.

Even this success of the French arms did not rouse Nasir Jang from his indolence; and Dupleix availing himself of the inactivity and of the general consternation which the rout of Muhammad Ali had created in the neighbouring parts, ordered D'Auteuil and Bussy to capture Gingee—"a place exceedingly strong and not ill fortified", which has been regarded as the strongest of all the forts in the Carnatic.

and more clearly in the pages of the *Diary* of Ananda Ranga Pillai. In July Muzaffar Jang is said to have attempted to escape from the custody of his uncle, while Captain Cope with a body of English troops joined, near Tiruvati, Muhammad Ali who had marched down from Arcot. Then took place a battle between him and the French in which Muhammad Ali was defeated and from which he made good his escape with some difficulty ; he was afraid to halt at Gingee which he was ordered to secure and where Nasir Jang had promised to send him reinforcements.

II.—Gingee under the Europeans

**Events leading to the French capture of Gingee
(September 1750).**

A

Nāsir Jang had, as already told, marched from his first camp at Arcot to Tiruvati, whence he sent a vakil to Governor Floyer demanding assistance. The French had then encamped 20 miles south-west of Pondicherry, with a body of 1000 Europeans, 2000 sepoy and *coffres* and 15,000 horse belonging to Muzaffar Jang and Chandā Sahib. Captain Cope was then ordered

to join Muzaffar Jang from Trichinopoly. Stringer Lawrence soon afterwards marched from Fort St. David with the troops that could be spared from its garrison; and after the latter's arrival at Nasir Jang's camp, the whole army advanced, whereupon, after a distant and ineffective cannonade for a day, the enemy retreated so precipitately as to leave behind 10 guns and 2 cohorns. The Marathas pursued the French as soon as their flight came to be known; but the latter escaped safely to Pondicherry.

After this reverse, the weak-minded Muzaffar Jang became very much depressed, separated his troops from Chanda Sahib and submitted promptly the very next day to Nasir Jang, who put him in confinement, but not of a strict kind. After this, Nasir Jang advanced to Valudāvur 7 miles to the west of Pondicherry. But he would not proceed further, because Lawrence now informed him that "the English could not act against the French in their Bounds, where they would be principals." Nasir Jang remained at Valudāvur for about a month and then moved to Arcot. Really the English did not accompany him, as he did not consent to their demand for first receiving grants for the Poonamallee country; and the English troops returned to Fort St. David. (April 22, O.S.)

Soon after this the French and Chanda Sahib marched out and began ravaging and levying contributions on the country. They captured Tiruvati and sent a party to Chidambaram where they plundered the suburbs and negotiated for a large contribution in return for their non-molestation of the temple at the place. At this juncture, Muhammad Ali wrote to Governor Floyer, saying that the French were fortifying themselves at Tiruvati and that Nasir Jang had drawn out a *farman* granting Poonamallee to the English, which he lodged with a substantial merchant of Arcot to be delivered over when Muhammad Ali should be formally appointed Nawab of the Carnatic in September, and also sending some amount in lieu of the Poonamallee revenues for the time being. Thereupon Captain Cope was sent out with 600 men and a field-train on June 30, (O.S.) and joined the Nawab who had reached the neighbourhood of Tiruvati on the west. The French withdrew from Chidambaram without having got any contribution, left a garrison in Tiruvati and retired into their bounds. The English continued in their camp till the middle of August. Two battles were fought at Tiruvati with a month's interval, one on the 19th of July (O.S.) and the other on the 20th of August (O.S.). In the first encounter the English and

Muhammad Ali were repulsed, while in the second Muhammad Ali whom the English had left to himself, was thoroughly crushed, his army was scattered and his camp burnt. He fled to Gingee, but not venturing to stand a siege there, retreated further.

During this action the English were quiescent at Cuddalore. Dupleix was resolved to take advantage of this inactivity of the English and within a couple of days after the second battle, ordered D'Auteuil to despatch Bussy with a body of soldiers, *coffres* and sepoys to march against Arcot by way of Villupuram and Gingee. Martineau tells us that this expedition was merely to force the hand of Nasir Jang to set free his nephew, Muzaffar Jang. Bussy was at Villupuram on the 25th August (O.S.) (5th September N.S.); Dupleix then did not intend that Gingee should be captured as he considered there was nothing in that place. First Bussy, and later D'Auteuil and Latouche, persuaded Dupleix to change his mind and allow the attempt on Gingee.¹ Dupleix was convinced that the

¹ "Writing to D'Auteuil and Latouche on the 2nd September, Dupleix said: 'I would never have thought that such an expedition might have been envied by anybody; but since you are of opinion that it would be worth the trouble, you may join Bussy and carry out your idea just as you please.' Two days previously, Dupleix had told D'Auteuil and Latouche that he had agreed to that

town could easily be taken. He had maintained at Gingee, previous to the descent of Nasir Jang into the Carnatic, a sergeant named St. Marc¹ and 10 soldiers, 20 East Indians and 50 sepoy and had gathered information from them that "there were several demolished places (probably in the ramparts) and that entrance through one of those breaches would be quite easy." He thought that the place would not cost a regular siege as Tanjore did and that if an unexpected attack should be made on it, even the sepoy alone could break through it.

Bussy was in sight of the town on the morning of the 31st August (O.S.) (or 11th of September N.S.); and almost simultaneously Muhammad Ali reached the place from the west; he had contrived to rally portions of his army and to assemble a large body of about 8,000 cavalry, 2,000 infantry, 1,000 English sepoy and 8 guns served by English gunners or European deserters. Bussy determined

expedition only 'to please' Bussy (Versailles Records No. 3746)." (*Bussy in the Deccan: tr. by Dr. Miss A. Cammiade, p. 8*).

¹ When Nasir Jang reached the Carnatic the "Quelidar" of Gingee handed over the town to him without the least difficulty, but Saint Marc was very courteously requested to go back to Pondicherry which he and his troops reached on the 18th March. (*Bussy in the Deccan, p. 9, note 2*).

on an immediate attack on the great fortress without waiting for the reinforcements which D'Auteuil was bringing along. We learn from Martineau that the Nawab's army defended itself much better than it did in the previous encounter. It did not fall back at the first cannonade, but approached the French troops within the range of their pistols. The battle developed at first to the advantage of the Nawab, when the sound of the firing was heard by D'Auteuil and he hastened to join Bussy with his men. Soon the united forces of Bussy and D'Auteuil vigorously drove the Nawab's troops back to the wall of the town, and by degrees, through it within the town itself, into which they followed them. By this time it was night-fall and the cannon which had been operating from the heights of the three hills ceased to fire effectively. But French artillery continued to ply during the first part of the night which was moonlit.

D'Auteuil and Bussy waited for the moon to disappear and complete darkness to set in, before starting to assault the three hills simultaneously. It was easy enough to proceed up the mild gradients of Krishnagiri and Chandrayandrug. But Rajagiri was more formidable. The entrance-gate at its foot luckily yielded to a few cracker shots; the

military outposts were captured; and no further resistance was met along the winding pathway encircling that citadel. Yet the French had no spies or 'Fifth Columnists' in the place; nor was there any treachery to help them. Martineau attributes the easy success of the French in capturing the entire area of the fortress, to the moral dismay of the previous defeat and to the lack of any special affection of the troops for Muhammad Ali.¹

¹ 'Dupleix writing to Brenier, the officer commanding at Gingee, on the 16th September, said: As to the spot from which the rock was scaled, undoubtedly we were dealing with men willing to allow things to occur, because the number of those who entered was insufficient to cause the governor to lose his head. (Versailles Records No. 3751).

"Even to the officers who had taken part in the attack, the matter seemed quite simple. On reading the official report jointly signed, on the day after their achievement, by d'Auteuil, Bussy, Law and Latouche, it does not seem that they realized that they had crowned themselves with fame. We give below this too abbreviated account.

"I (d'Auteuil) divided the troops and placed the Sepoys on the outskirts. I put in position the artillery and the two mortars which were very gallantly attended to by M. Galland. While Messrs. de Saint George, Very and Lenormand were ordered to scale one of the forts (Rajagiri) as soon as the moon had set, which they most valiantly carried out. The Dragoons under Puymorin were meant to give support to those who had to blow up the doors of the main fort, which I was to force through with Latouche and Bussy. In the meantime the enemy was firing heavily muskets and guns and throwing in a large quantity of rockets. Six of our men had

already been killed and some wounded when I sent M. de Rouvray to reconnoitre the doorway. This brave officer was shot through the body while returning and died the next day.

“Mr. Law having reported the execution of the orders we remained in our positions till the moon set, which had been fixed upon as the signal for action on all sides. In the meantime, Mr. Galland belaboured the enemy with grenades. About 4 A.M. I heard shouts of “Long live the King” from one of the hill tops, they came from Messrs. St. George. Very and Lenormane who had performed that part of the attack which had been entrusted to them.

“I had then the doors of the chief fort blown up. Behind these doors was a fairly large town. After some musket firing the enemy took fright and fled. In less than an hour we were masters of all the place. The fugitives took shelter in their fortresses on two hills (the Krishnagiri and the Chandra Dourgam) which were at the back of us and they held out for awhile. But Mr. Law and his Dragoons soon forced the remainder of the enemy to flee and we were left the unmolested owners of Gingy and all its fortresses.”

“The French had only eleven men wounded and 10 killed ; as for the losses of the enemy they were not known. In a letter dated 15th Sep. Dupleix said that the enemy had two thousand men killed ; but this figure seems greatly exaggerated.

“On the next day Bussy whose initiative had won such a success, received the most hearty congratulations of Dupleix who wrote ; “You deserve the highest rewards and I shall do all I can to have them bestowed on you.” (1) Notwithstanding this the Governor was not fully convinced of the worth of Gingy. In a letter to Engineer Sornay, Dupleix declared officially that he did not intend staying at Gingy, but would remain there only such time as would be necessary to force the Suba to conclude peace as he was convinced that the smartness and rapidity of that brilliant action would make a deep impression on the Suba. (*Bussy in the Deccan* : tr. by Dr. Miss A. Cammiade, pp. 11-13).

**M—From the Fall of Gingee into French Hands
down to the Assassination of Nasir Jang
(December 1750)**

The French capture of Gingee awakened Nasir Jang to the true peril of his situation¹. He now ordered Muhammad Ali to lay seige to thāt fortress and to recapture it and also to prevent absolutely any help reaching the Gingee garrison from Pondicherry. Muhammad Ali sent his *bakshi*, Muhammad Abrār Khan, with an army to Gingee. Meanwhile, the disloyal courtiers of Nasir Jang persuaded him to order the forces of Muhammad Ali to proceed to Conjeevaram which, they said, was in danger of an attack by the French troops from Chingleput; and thus Abrār Khan was recalled from his march to Gingee and sent with augmented forces to Conjeevaram. Thus, in the quaint words of Burhanu'd-din, 'the *maidān* of impudence became extensive for the French and for those corrupted by mischief.'

¹ Gingee was deemed quite impregnable; and even Sivaji with his huge force was able to capture it only after coming to an understanding with the Bijapuri commander of the place. Later, it had defied for seven years (1691-1698) the best efforts of the most renowned general of Aurangzeb. Such a fort was now ordered to be attacked by Dupleix.

Bussy's forces which consisted of 250 Europeans and 1,200 sepoys, advanced to surprise Gingee, while the

On the other hand, Dupleix boasted that he had definitely heard from one of the Maratha *mansabdārs* in Nasir Jang's camp that, if the French had marched on Arcot immediately after they took Gingee, Nasir Jang himself could have been easily seized.

main army under D'Auteuil followed him. Bussy encamped at a place three miles from Gingee and found there about five thousand fugitives from Tiruvati who had taken refuge in the place with some European artillery. Bussy threw them into confusion when the army under D'Auteuil came up. A general panic ensued and Bussy pushed and drove the fugitives under the walls of Gingee.

Bussy's troops then petarded the principal gate of the fort and got hold of it, with the loss of only three or four men. Then they entered the town where they immediately fortified themselves. However, they found their position exposed to a continuous fire from the summits of the three mountains. The Muhammadans tried to set fire to the combustible stores that belonged to the French. Bussy replied by bombarding the forts with mortars and firing upon them with artillery until the moon set, which was the signal to storm the fortifications.

Orme, in paying a tribute to the French on their capture of the fort, has observed thus: "None but the Europeans were destined to this hardy enterprize, who attacked all the three mountains at the same time and found on each redoubts above redoubts which they carried successively sword in hand until they came to the summits where the fortifications were stronger than those they had surmounted. They nevertheless pushed on and petarded the gates, and by day-break were in possession of them all, having lost only twenty men in the different attacks. On contemplating the difficulties they had overcome, they were astonished at the rapidity of their success and the pusillanimity of the defenders; and indeed, had the attack been made in day light it could not

have succeeded, for the Moors, as well as Indians, often defend themselves behind strong walls. No advantages either of number or situation can countervail the terror with which they are struck when attacked in the night."

Kincaid and Parasnis in their "A History of the Maratha People," Vol. II, have observed thus: "As the sun rose, the great captain looked with awe at the stupendous towers that frowned below him and asked himself by what miracle he had achieved the impossible. As he wondered there arose above his head, to flutter triumphant in the breeze, the lily-decked banner of the most brilliant of nation."

After the fall of Gingee the French took care to secure the fort by a strong garrison, supporting them well with artillery and ammunition.

The remarks of Malleson on the capture of Gingee are worth quoting here.

"It was indeed a wonderful achievement, great in itself and calculated by its effect upon the people of Southern India to be much greater. They were no second rate warriors who could within twenty-four hours defeat an army superior in numbers and storm a fortress reputed impregnable and which for several years had defied the best army and the renowned generals of Aurangzeb. Not lightly would such a great feat be esteemed in the cities of the South. The fame of it would extend even to Imperial Delhi on the one side and to the palaces of Poona on the other." *History of the French in India*, pp. 264-265).

According to our Tamil Chronicler, Narayanan, Muhammad Ali Khan encamped at Tiruvati and strengthened his base by raising round his camp a wall of protection. Hasanu'd-din Khan, the French sepoy-captain, by instruction of La Touche, now made an advance upon Muhammad Ali's camp: while the latter attacked the enemy with a charge of cavalry, but was forced to retreat. He abandoned his camp at Tiruvati and fled by way of Tirukoyilur and took up his stand to the north of Gingee fortress and in front of the tank of Sirukadambur. La Touche advanced to Tumbur to the north of Villupuram; Hasanu'd-din led a body of

Ever since the marvellous capture of Gingee on the 11th September 1750, it was highly valued by the French. Its capture enhanced the prestige of the French in the eyes of the natives and it served to consolidate the French power in the Carnatic.

The capture of Gingee raised the fame of the French power so much that Nasir Jang, roused from his lethargy by the loss of

10,000 men against the fort and reached a place a few miles south of Gingee. Theroupon Muhammad Ali made an attack on Hasanu'd-din's troops and fired his artillery pieces. La Touche now came to the help of Hasanu'd-din and Muhammad Ali's men fell back and retreated towards the fortress of Gingee, hoping to maintain a defence therefrom. The *killēdār* of the place, Mirza Hasan Beg, and the garrison of Nasir Jang would not, strangely enough, allow Muhammad Ali to enter the fort. Muhammad Ali could not thus get the protection of the fort and was forced to retreat by way of Tiruvannamalai to Arcot. La Touche and Hasanu'd-din pursued the retreating troops of Muhammad Ali and when they were to the east of the fort, they were fired upon with the cannon from Rajagiri. One of the shots struck the followers of La Touche who thereupon became angry and ordered an assault on the fort. The main body of the garrison, including the *killēdār*, fled through the *Vélur darwaza* and joined Muhammad Ali's troops; but the others that remained continued to fight. The French brought their artillery to ply upon the *Fatēh darwaza*, broke into the *pettah* and plundered the house of the inhabitants. The Tamil Chronicler says that all the houses were plundered of their valuables and the town lost its entire prosperity from that time; and this took place in the month of *Purotasi*, *Pramōduta*. La Touche was put in charge of the *killēdārī* and the remaining French troops proceeded north and encamped at Chetpat, but after a time returned to the plain a few miles to the north of Gingee.

the important fortress, resolved to retake it at any cost. He felt that the French should either be crushed or conciliated. He preferred the latter course and sent two of his officers to treat with Dupleix who insisted on the restoration of Muzaffar Jang to his former power and the appointment of Chanda Sahib as the Nawab of Arcot. Dupleix further desired that the French troops should keep possession of Gingee till Nasir Jang should return to his head-quarters. Naturally Nasir Jang could not agree to the proposed terms of Dupleix ; and he then resolved to try the fortunes of war.

Nasir Jang ordered his troops to march towards Gingee in the latter part of September 1750. His army was now much less numerous than when he entered the Carnatic, after the battle of Ambur. His forces amounted to 60,000 foot and 45,000 horse, 700 elephants and 360 pieces of cannon.

He actually moved out from Arcot only in the month of Karthigai (November-December 1750) with the aim of attacking Pondicherry and encamped in the plain of Elangadu. Ghulam Takya Khan, the *killēdār* of Wandiwash, who had sent his son as his wakil at the Nizam's camp, now prepared for some resistance ; but he found that his fort had been surrounded by the troops of the Nizam ; and

on the advice of his son, Ali Naqi, he sent a letter of obedience along with the customary *nazar* and invited Nasir Jang and all his nobles, including Muhammad Ali, to be his guests. Takya Khan welcomed them warmly and seated them in his durbar hall each according to his respective rank, feasted them and sent them away with appropriate gifts of dress and money. He then visited the Nizam in his camp, spent some time with him in conversation and returned to his *killa*, with an order of confirmation of his jagir given by the Nawab (Nasir Jang), while his son continued to be in the camp. . From Wandiwash, the Nawab proceeded some distance towards Vellimedupet to the north-east of Gingee. The French forces were then encamped in the immediate neighbourhood of Gingee. When some French troops under Muzaffar Khan Garde were marching by way of Villupuram, a party of the Nizam's sardars came upon and fought an engagement with them and contrived to secure the person of Muzaffar Khan, keeping him a prisoner in Nasir Jang's camp. One of the 22 amirs that were in the Nawab's camp, Himmat Bahadur Khan of Kurnool who cherished treachery, now wrote a letter to La Touche, inviting him to make a concerted attack on the Nizam's camp on a particular day. The

immense army of the Nawab was not in one united camp formation; but it was distributed in various places while the rains were very heavy and caused much damage and loss of life.¹ Events hastened in quick succession, culminating in the assassination of Nasir Jang in the middle his camp, with his treacherous nobles in league with the French who were actually invited to attack his position.

¹ Now as to the actual circumstances which culminated in the assassination of Nawab Nazir Jang, in his camp, by Himmat Bahadur Khan, Nawab of Kurnool, who had already incited the French captain La Touche to make an attack on the army, first, we have the account of Narayana Pillai, the Chronicler. The gist of it is as follows: Himmat Bahadur informed La Touche that he would communicate to him a favourable opportunity when he might make a night attack on the Nawab's forces and his cannonading should be so effective as not to be replied to. "Then I shall strike down the Nawab and even usurp his position; and I shall give you possession of the Carnatic." La Touche did not believe in the words of Himmat Bahadur Khan and required that he should take an oath on the *Quran* with reference to his promise of help on the occasion of the attack. Thereupon Himmat Bahadur Khan secretly sent to the French captain, through a messenger, a copy of the *Quran*, which he said, was a pledge of the sincerity of his promise. This was believed in by La Touche who replied that his troops would advance at the appointed moment. One day, Himmat Bahadur Khan sent word that the occasion had come; and thereupon La Touche approached Neganur, which is about six miles distant to the north-east of Gingee in the direction of Vellimedu. Just then Himmat Bahadur Khan sent contrary information that the moment was not favourable; and La Touche had to return to his former camp. Four days later, Himmat Bahadur sent word that La Touche might now advance towards

the *ahadi* of Nasir Jang's camp. Upon this La Touche advanced by way of the Desur road, reached the *ahadi* of the Nawab's camp, while it was four *nāzhigais* to dawn and fired. When the Nawab was informed of this, he gave orders to the *darōgha* of his *tōpkhana* to fire with his cannon. The firing was done with empty powder at first. In the meantime the French troops had penetrated to some distance into the Nawab's camp. The Nawab ordered his elephant to be made ready and mounted the *howdah*. The *jamadar* of the *Kurch chowki* was ordered to proceed with 2000 horse to the *tōpkhana*. The *jamadar* thereupon replied : 'The French troops are not numerous; some *fitur* (rebel) has invited them to come. There is danger impending. I request you to stay on in this place for the space of an hour after which the sun would rise, when the Maratha troops and those of the (Carnatic) Faujdar, Mahammad Ali, would be ready and we can beat the small number of the French. I would entreat you to do so.' The Nawab became angry and exclaimed:— "I shall go to the side of my brother, Himmat Bahadur Khan. You had better advance to the *ahadi tōpkhana*." Even then the *jamadar* continued to remonstrate against the Nawab's order. The Nawab became irritated at this and exclaimed, "you are *haram* to me." The *jamadar* felt very sorry and had to obey the order and go to the *tōpkhana* with his men. The French troops had now come into the middle of the Nawab's camp. The Nawab then ordered his elephant to be driven to the side of Himmat Bahadur. The *mahout* said : "Sir, the elephant refuses to proceed ; you should not go to Himmat Bahadur. You can go either to the camp of the Marathas or to the side of Faujdar Muhammad Ali." The Nawab became angry with the *mahout* and said that Himmat Bahadur was as a brother to him and would not plan treachery and asked him to take him quickly to his side. Unable to do anything, the *mahout* drove his elephant in the direction indicated, and the Nawab's brothers, Salabat Jang, Basalat Jang, and Nizam Ali Khan and others had to accompany him. Then all the chiefs in the camp became aware of the critical situation and began to set their forces in order for action. The Nawab approached the elephant of Himmat Bahadur Khan and addressed thus : "There are so many treacherous amirs in the camp and not one would go to

After the Nawab was assassinated the French troops pushed their way to the personal encampment of Nasir Jang where they found in his tent an immense treasure amounting to two millions sterling, in money and jewels, by which they made their fortunes. To perpetuate the memory of this great and unexpected triumph, Dupleix caused a town to be built nearby which was named *Fath-abad* (town of victory). The exact site of this scene has formed the subject of keen controversy.¹

attack the French troops who have advanced into our midst." On these words, Himmat Bahadur without any reply or hesitation, raised his pistol and shot the Nawab who thereupon sank down in the *howdah*. Himmat Bahadur then brought his own *howdah* close to that of the Nawab, jumped into the latter, cut off his head, fixed it on his spear and raised it aloft. Just then dawn broke. Muhammad Ali Khan Bahadur now came fully armed, along with his *bakshi*, Ghazanfar Ali Khan, to the scene and also some amirs and the Marathas. But finding that the head of Nasir Jang was raised on a spear, all of them resolved to depart; and Ghazanfar Ali, accompanying Muhammad Ali Khan, galloped along the road to Trichinopoly by the south of Desur and north of Pennatur and within two *jamams*, reached the jungle of Manalurpet.

¹ The site of this so-called battle of Gingee: (*Vellimedupet*) and of Dupleix *Fath-abad*.

Mon. A. Lehuraux of Chandernagore contends that the place which was called Fath-abad was at Vellimedupet, to the north-east of Gingee. Writing to the author from Calcutta, under date 6-5-1939, about the place of Nasir Jang's 'martyrdom' he thus says:—

"From a manuscript which I read in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, viz., the Diary of Bussy's march

from Pondicherry to Aurangabad, with the new Nawab' Muzaffar Jang, the site of the murder of Nawab Nasir Jang may be identified. The detachment under Bussy set out on January 15, 1751 from Perimby near Vilnur (Villiyannallur) and marched 7 kos = 19.30 miles, the official kos being 2.76 miles. They halted 2 days at an unnamed place and then, on the following day, proceeded on a second stage of 8 kos (= 22 miles) and passed near the fort of Wandiwash. It will, I think, be easy for anyone familiar with the topography of the country to locate Nasir Jang's camp from these particulars; Mailam proximately represents the limit of the first day's march, 20 miles north of Perimby. Starting again from Mailam, the detachment advanced 22 miles. Now Mailam is 28 miles south of Wandiwash. Therefore when the detachment had reached a spot some five miles south of Wandiwash, it had passed over the scene of the death of Nasir Jang. I told you (in a previous conversation) I surmised there must be 4 identifying marks viz:—

1. a large ruined *mantapam* (noticed by Clive)
2. Traces of a burnt-out village (Dupleix-Fath-abad)
3. Grave-stones indicating a vast battle-field.
4. Local tradition of a great fight and the death of the Nizam."

He further writes on this topic:

"With regard to the site of Nasir Jang's murder, Colonel Lawrence's 'Narrative of the war on the coast of Coromandel' states that Clive burnt the town (Dupleix Fath-abad) and destroyed the monument on which the (commemorative) pillar was to have been erected." He did not plough the land. There is also no evidence that he destroyed the *chaudri* (*choultry* or *mantapam*) that had been erected, not to the glorification of the French, but to the memory of the murdered Nawab. Further, as the locality had been the scene of hard fighting, the neighbourhood should be found to contain Muhammadan grave-stones. Thus the locality is a spot "16 or 17 miles (eastward) from Gingee" (Orme) or 40 miles (20 kos) from Pulcheri (*Sarwe Azad*). Within these limits, I must find—

- (1) a fairly large *chaudri* (*choultry*) probably in ruins.

- (2) Evidence of a burnt-out village (though this will be difficult to identify),
- (3) Grave-stones, here and there,
- (4) a local tradition of a great fight and the Nawab's assassination."

"The following localities are suggested as being the probable site:—

- (a) Dupleix mentioned Sarasangupettai (on the route between Wandiwash and Villupuram) *vide* Anandaranga Pillai's conversation with Dupleix (d. 7th October 1752 in Vol. VIII of the *Diary*, pp. 239-241).
- (b) Tanyal near Nemali, on the plain, east of Desur (the French attack was delivered at Desur),
- (c) Velimedoupet,
- (d) Katteri,
- (e) Senal,
- (f) Sarodrium (Strotriem?) Katteri."

Further, M. Lehuraux had discussed the question with Prof. Dubreuil and M. Fauchaux, "two distinguished explorers" of Pondicherry; and they were of the opinion that Nasir Jang's camp could never have extended so far as Balachetti Chatram, near Conjeevaram. A map of 1770 shows this choultry as well as another in the neighbourhood of Desur.

An old route-map of the period in the Pondicherry Archives expressly states that Nasir Jang's camp extended from Fattehpeth and Balachetti Chatram "on the route to Chetpet." Further the French troops under La Touche burned the Nawab's camp and attacked him from the rear (Desur). This movement could never have been accomplished successfully if the camp had extended so far as Balachetti Chatram near Conjeevaram. The French force would, in that case, have merely cut into the Nawab's army — a very perilous position exposing them to be caught between two forces. Prof. Dubreuil thinks that Nasir Jang was killed at *Sanal*, between Nerkunam and Tellar. Mons. Fauchaux believes that

the site is Tanyal. Dupleix himself seems to indicate the scene of the murder to be Sarasangupettai, between Wandiwash and Villupuram. (The note of the edition of the Diary of Anandaranga Pillai says of this :— “Not known, perhaps a corruption of Nasir-jangai konra-pettai—the village where Nasir Jang was killed.”)

(C. S. Srinivasachari: *Ananda Ranga Pillai, the ‘Pepys’ of French India*, pp. 190-192, foot-notes.)

Some pages in Tamil which were discovered by Mon. Lehuraux at the Montbrun Mansion in Fondicherry and found on examination by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastriar, to be unpublished pages of the *Diary* of Ananda Ranga Pillai referring to various dates, many of which fall between November 11, 1751 and January 2, 1752,—there being a hiatus in the published portions of the Diary—contain, among other matter, entry under date 12th November 1751, the following:—

“This morning, M. Dupleix having decided to place an inscription at Dupleix-Fathabad, where Nasir Jang was killed by Himmat Bahadur wrote:—

“The 35th year of the Louis XV, the 3rd year of the reign of Ahmad Shah the French General Provost de Latouche, acting in the name of Governor Dupleix, killed Nasir Jang on this spot,”

“This inscription was to be written in 6 languages, viz: French, Tamil, Telugu, Persian, Gujarati and Mah-ratti. Dupleix gave the French text to the engineer M. Abeille who was to engrave it as well as the other texts.”

“It brings to light for the first time, the text of the inscription for the famous commemorative pillar which Dupleix selected for the projected site of the city of of Dupleix-Fateh-abad, and which was six months later, destroyed by Clive. (I. H. R. Commission, Proceedings of the Meetings, Vol. XVII, Baroda, pp. 10-11 of Appendix C.)

Mon. Lehuraux is convinced that the site between the half-ruined *mantapam* and the adjacent tank, locally known as the Komarappa Kulam situated in the Putha-nandal village, north of Vellimedupet, in the taluk of

**C—The exact site and date of Nasir Jang's
Death.**

Colonel Malleson and other European historians hold that it was 16 miles from Gingee where Nasir Jang's army, advancing from Arcot, was routed by the French who were assisting the troops of Chanda Sahib; and Nasir Jang was treacherously slain by some of his Pathan allies in the course of the battle, which took place on the 15th December 1750. Macaulay, repeating these historians, says that Dupleix founded at this battle—site a town of the name of Dupleix Fathabad and in memory of his own victory, erected in it a tower; but later Clive destroyed this tower and town in such a way that not one vestige of them remains.

Another view is that Nasir Jang's army, starting from Arcot and marching four miles every day, reached the north bank of the River Chiriyar in the beginning of October,

Tindivanam in the South Arcot District, near mile-stone No. 35 on the Tindivanam-Wandiwash road, is very likely the site of the city of Dupleix Fathabad, in the centre of which the French Governor Dupleix intended to raise a *gopuram*, commemorating his victory, and beneath which he buried commemorative medals, photos of which, obtained from the *Cabinet des Medailles* of the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, are in the mover's possession. If the original medals are unearthed it will prove the identity of an interesting historical site.

and thence marched towards Gingee and camped at Desur. Here the army remained inactive on account of rains, flooding of rivers, and difficulties of communication; and at this place the Nawab's treacherous chiefs slew him. Desur lies the south of Arcot at a distance of 20 miles and to the east of Chetpat, the west of Wandiwash and north of Gingee.

Another point of doubt is as to the particular date and day on which the assassination of Nasir Jang took place. Professor Jouveau-Dubreuil and Mon. Lehuraux are of the opinion that the murder happened on the night of the 17th Mohurram (1164 A.H.) = $1\frac{5}{8}$ December 1750 A.D. The night of the 16th of Mohurram was the time of the murder according to Mir Najaf Ali Khan, a courtier of Nasir Jang, who was in his camp and was an eye-witness of the events and wrote the *Rāhat Afza* in 1171 A.H., in which he minutely described the Arcot expedition of Nasir Jang and the battle of Gingee, the details being such "as have not been possible to find in any other work." The *Rāhat Afza* also says that Nasir Jang's army was on the Chakravati river, so near the Gingee fort that shots from his camp could reach the fort; in fact the distance between Nasir Jang's forces and the fort was about that of a gun-shot. Hakim Sayyid Shams-ullah Qadri, who has written a *Critical Note on the Murder-Site of Nawab Nasir Jang for the Nawab Imad-ul-Mulk Memorial Volume*, says that the spot where the assassination took place was near the Gingee fort on the other side of the Chakrāvati river, i.e., on its north bank—from Phulchery towards Gingee 20 kos (40 miles) and from Gingee towards Bailpur 1 kos (2 miles).

Besides the *Rāhat Afza*, we have three contemporary accounts of the expedition and the death of Nasir Jang.

(1) *Tarikh-i-Fathiyah*—Its author is Yusuf Muhammad Khan Tash-kandi who was a courtier of Nawab Asaf Jah Bahadur as also a courtier of his successor Nawab Nasir Jang. This courtier writes of those events of the Arcot

Mr. Quadri concludes from a clear examination of the *Rūhat Afza* that Nasir Jang's army was encamped at a distance of 9 *kos*, i.e., 18 miles from Bailpur (Villupuram); that in front of Nawab's army and by the side of the Gingee fort was the river Chakravati; that the Nawab's *haraval* was on the bank of Chakravati river near the water; that the Nawab's artillery bombarded the Gingee fort and the French returned the fire on the Nawab's camp; that De la Touche who was in the fort was incited by the traitors in Nasir Jang's camp to attack the Nawab's army; that on the 13th Mohurram Mir Najaf Ali

expedition of which he himself was an eye-witness; but unfortunately we cannot get any answer from him as to the time and the site of the Nawab's death. He simply says in one place that Nawab Nasir Jang's army was encamped between two rivers.

(2) *Sarw-e-Azad* — Its author, Mir Ghulam Ali Azad Bilgrami, was tutor to Nawab Nasir Jang and was with him during his marches and campaigns. Two hours before his death, Nawab Nasir Jang had called him to his presence. This author wrote his history in 1166 A.H., and in it he recorded that near Gingee, and fifty miles from Phulchery (Pondicherry) the Nawab was slain.

(3) Nawab Samsam-ud-Dawlah Shah Nawaz Khan's *Māthir-ul-Umara* — This Nawab Samsam-ud-Dawlah was a nobleman of Nawab Nasir Jang's court and was with him in the Arcot expedition, and his son Mir Abdulhai Khan Samsam-ul-Mulk later completed this *Māthir-ul-Umara* in 1191 A.H. In it the murder of Nawab Nasir Jang as well as other events of his life are mentioned in two places, which are copied word by word from Maulana Azad's *Sarw-e-Azad* and the *Khazana-i-Anura*.

Khan who had marched from Tiruvannamalai and approached the base of the Gingee fort from the south, proposed to scale the walls of Gingee which were very low from the side of the west; that this was on the night of the 13th Mohurram, but the attack did not take place; and three nights thus passed off without any activity; and that on the fourth night the cry of the enemy's approach rose, but the army ridiculed the news and slept soundly.

We can now quote the words of Mr. Quadri detailing the murder of Nawab Nasir Jang. "At about one in the morning the Nawab was preparing for *Namaz-e-Tahajjud*, when the sound of gun fire was heard from the camps of Janoji and the Afghan chiefs; thus there arose confusion in the camp. The French broke the front line and attacked the centre of the army. The Nawab's own gunners began to fire on his tents.

"During this confusion, the Nawab ordered his elephant to be brought out and mounting it started from his camp with three thousand horsemen; and repelling the French, and passing in their midst, he reached the Afghan troopers who were quite silent in the front lines. Himat Bahadur Khan—the governor of Kurnool, Abdul Nabi Khan—the

governor of Cuddappah, Abdul Hakim Khan—the governor of Savnoor, all mounted on elephants, were also standing by with their men.

“When the Nawab’s elephant approached that of Himat Bahadur Khan, the Nawab first saluted him and advised him to advance and drive away the rebels. But Himat Bahadur Khan without saluting and without a word, shot Nasir Jang in the chest with the ‘shirbacha’ and the Nawab died the same instant. This event occurred on the 16th of Muharram, Wednesday, before sunrise, at dawn.”

Mir Najaf Ali Khan had taken three forts to the west and east of Gingee; (1) Silatgadh (2) Narwarangam and (3) Rawatnallur, which was 10 miles from Narwarangam. He then turned his attention to Palawatvanam (old Vettavalam) and to Kalol-gadh (Kallākurichi?). Palawatvanam was behind Gingee; Kālōlgadh was in the possession of Muzaffar Khan Gardee and near it, at a distance of 10 miles, was the fort of Vardavar, where the French had an outpost to prevent supplies reaching the Nawab; to the right of Kalolgadh, at a distance of about 8 miles was Talkanoor and on the left at a distance of 10 miles was Rawatnallur. On the 11 of November 1750, there was an

action near Villupuram between Muzaffar Khan Gardee who was daily bringing in supplies from Pondicherry and Najaf Ali Khan. Muzaffar Khan was defeated; he retreated and crossed the Chakravati to the other side. Here the Gingee forces were patrolling and took him captive, so that Najaf Ali Khan was not merely master of all the country to the west and south of Gingee but also of all the plain to the east from Chakravati to Villupuram.

The forces under the Afghan Nawabs were on the left of the *haraval* of Nasir Jang's camp, *i.e.*, a little to the east of Gingee close to the Chakravati and the Nawab was killed in the midst of these forces. Mr. Quadri has given the plan of Nawab Nasir Jang's camp arrangement in order to make his position very clear. This is as given below :—

* (1)	(2)	(3)
Right	<i>Manqala</i>	Left
Janoji four thousand horse and five thousand foot.	Raja Ramchander five thousand horse and five thousand foot.	Forces of Himat Bahadur Khan and Abdul Nabi Khan the governors of Cuddappah and Karnool and the Chief of Savnoor.
(4)		
<i>Chandaval</i>		
Ghulam Murtaza Qilladar of Vellore and other Qilladars of the Karnatak.		

Two difficulties have got to be explained ;
 (1) If the Chakravati was in floods and also the surrounding country was water-logged, could the French have crossed the Chakravati from the Gingee side on to the other bank into the Nawab's camp? (2) How to take the French version that made the French army move out of their camp in order to go into the Nawab's camp.

Mon. Lehuraux who has made a very critical and intensive study of the whole question is convinced that the Nawab was

(5)	(6)	(7)
Right	<i>Hiraval Qalb</i>	Left
Vir Nayak and other zamindars five thousand horse and five thousand foot.	Shah Nawaz Khan five thousand horse.	Laehman Rao and Murar Rao five thousand horse and five thousand foot.
(8)	(9)	(10)
Right	<i>Qalb</i>	Left
Anwar-ud-din Khan ten thousand horse and ten thousand foot with guns, jazail & rahekala.	Nawab Nasir Jang with Muhammad Khan Bakhshi and Shahbeg Khan Khan-saman and Muhammad Sa'id Risaladar with ten thousand horse.	Rahmatulla Khan and Amanullah Khan and Chief of Srirangapatam ten thousand horse and ten thousand foot with guns, jazail and Rahekala.
(11)		
<i>Saranjam</i>		
Khan Alam and Qazi Daim with two thousand horse and two thousand foot.		
Safshikan Khan & Yaqoob Khan and Mooqtada Khan with five thousand horse.		

assassinated at some distance from Gingee near Velimedupet. He says that Sarasangu-pettai, mentioned in the *Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai*, cannot be derived from an imaginary term '*Nasir-jangai-konra pettai*' and that Professor Jouveau-Dubreuil has correctly traced it to Dupleix Fateh-abad under the name '*Zafar Jang pettai*' (the city of Zafar Jang or Dupleix).

Let us now turn to the references in the English records and the inferences that may be drawn from them. Clive wrote from his camp on his way from Arcot to the neighbourhood of Fort St. David, on March 8, 1752, that "he was encamped on the ground where Nasir Jang was cut off, in commemoration whereof a very fine Choultry was erected and a village, which monument of villainy he designs destroying and expected to be here the 11th." Orme converts the village into "a rising town projected by the vanity of Mr. Dupleix to commemorate that detestable action, and called Dupleix-Fateabad or the town of Dupleix's victory," and adds "it is said that he was preparing a column with a pompous inscription in the French, Malabar, Persic and Indostan languages, which he intended to erect in the middle of the town, where he had already caused coins struck with symbols of the victory to be buried." Macaulay omits the

important words of Orme (it is said), in his essay on Clive; “the column becomes a stately pillar; coins struck with the symbols of victory become medals stamped with the emblems of his successes; they were buried within the foundations of the stately pillar and round it arose a town.”

Sir George Forrest in his ‘Life of Lord Clive,’ ‘Vol. I, (1918)’ thus tries to comment on this affair: “From the records of the time we now learn that in order to commemorate a ‘detestable action’ won by foul treachery, Dupleix had erected a splendid rest house for travellers on the battle-field. Both in erecting a memorial and in the nature of the memorial he was following an eastern custom, and he did it to impress the oriental mind as to the power of the French; and Clive levelled the splendid choultry and village to the ground, thereby altering the native impression as to the respective powers of the French and English. The work of destruction could not have been very onerous, for three days after the receipt of his last letter, Clive encamped within the bounds of Fort St. David.”

From the Madras records themselves we have a clear chronological notice of the movements of Clive in that momentous week.

Monday the 9th.—Sunday—Letters from Captain Clive to the President are produced to the Board and read and the most material part of them as follows.—The first is dated the 2nd instant at Arcot, gives a more particular account of the late action, and that he had left a party to watch the Prisoners at Covrepauk, that having intelligence, some money, elephants and all young Chunda's Baggage was left at Vellour Pettah, he had sent to demand them of Moortaz Ally Caun and intended proceeding thither the next morning to look after them, and after refreshing his people a little should set out for this place. The second dated the 7th instant that he is on his march hither, and on his approaching Chetteput, young Chunda retired to Gingee and from thence to Pondicherry, that he was encamped to the eastward of Gingee, and hoped to be within ten or twelve miles of Pondicherry to-day. The last dated yesterday, that he should immediately despatch a letter to Lieutenant Grenville at Arcot to send the cannon, etc., to Fort St. George, but was apprehensive, the difficulty he found himself in transporting them thither from Covrepauk would prevent his getting Cooleys to draw them; that judging it unnecessary on account of the enemy's defeat he has not despatched any men to Madras and was then

encamped on the ground where Nasir Jung was cut off, in commemoration whereof a very fine Choultry was erected, and a village, which Monument of Villainy he designs destroying and expected to be the 11th."

Thomas Saunders,
Charles Boddam,
Henry Powney,
Alexander Wynch.

11th.—At about 5 this afternoon arrived Captain Clive with the Forces under his command at Trivendupuram where they encamped and orders were immediately issued out for bringing in all such necessaries as were in want of repair and to get the same done as soon as possible, also that the necessary supplies of ammunition, etc., for the use of the camp be got ready with the greatest expedition.

We may presume that the work of destruction should have been done by Clive between the 8th March when he wrote to Madras that he was encamped on the ground where Nasir Jung was cut off and the 10th when he should have started at the latest in order to have been on the evening of the 11th at Tiruvendipuram, 4 miles west of Fort St. David. Perhaps the place was destroyed on the 9th

of March, 20th N.S. At least two days may have to be allowed for Clive's march from near that place to the neighbourhood of Fort St. David.

It is not a village that was thus destroyed, but only a choultry or a monument. Moreover, a village would comprehend scattered dwellings, most of them of mud and thatch and not worth positive destruction. It is likely that it was the choultry that is qualified by the words "which monument of villainy."

According to the *Tuzak-i-Walajahi*, Nawab Muhammad Ali advised Nasir Jang who had encamped on the *maidan* of Gingee that the encampment would serve as a means for treachery and that "it would be better to encamp on the *maidan* adjoining the *qasba* of Belpur (Villupuram), for it was very extensive, its level high, and the whole army could be gathered at one place." Nawab Nasir Jang took the suggestion, but postponed the day of his march owing to insidious counsels. The *Tuzak* further says that though Nasir Jang was warned by Mir Dayim Ali Khan, the sardar of the advance guard of the army, as to the treachery of the Pathan Nawabs and their negotiations with the French through Mir Sayfullah and the impending attack proposed for that very night, Nasir Jang did not regard the danger as serious. On the

same night at about 3 o'clock, the French came out of Gingee and marched into the camp, cannonading without any opposition or molestation. Nasir Jang then saw the seriousness of the situation and realized his danger. Immediately he sent for Hidayat Muhiyyu'd-din Khan for the purpose of killing him. The latter was reading the *Quran* in pretence, while Raja Ram Das bribed the executioners and delayed their purpose. By that time the French had come near. Nasir Jang had performed his ablutions twice over and got up on his elephant without wearing any armour and coat of mail and without other arms. Part of the army was not aware of the French attack; others were negligent or pretended ignorance; and there were no people near the Nawab, except some *bandars* and torch-bearers. In the meanwhile, the day began to dawn and Nasir Jang caught sight of the Nawabs of Cuddapah and Kurnool riding on their elephants. Contrary to practice, he directed his own elephant towards them and offered salutations to them first. But they pretended not to see him. Nasir Jang saluted them a second time and exclaimed: "It is incumbent on you and me, brothers of the same faith, to fight the stranger." "In the course of this observation Himmat Bahadur Khan aimed at the Wazir with the musket, and the bullet pierced his innocent heart."

Nawab Muhammad Ali in great secrecy and fear came out of the camp with Ghazanfar Ali Khan and with a guide, pretending that he would return soon. He rode towards the taluk of Tiruvannamalai and ultimately reached Trichinopoly after encountering a serious crisis at Ranjangudi whose *killēdar* was very near capturing him.

The Tamil Chronicler Narayanan definitely gives us information that (1) Nawab Nasir Jang encamped at the *maidan* of Velimedupet to the north-east of Gingee and that the French troops had formed a camp near Gingee. Muzaffar Khan was captured by the Nawab's troops in the course of an encounter during his march from Villupuram to Gingee carrying supplies. (2) Himmat Bahadur Khan of Kurnool, one of the 22 Amirs with the Nizam, opened a correspondence with La Touche in Gingee, advising him to cannonade the Nawab's camp at night-time and telling him that he would co-operate with the French troops that might advance against the camp. La Touche would not, at first, believe the promises of Himmat Bahadur and insisted on the latter taking an oath on the *Quran*. (3) One day when he received information from Himmat Bahadur as to the favourable moment of attack, La Touche marched to Niganur at a distance of a few miles from his camp. But

being told that the time was not fully opportune, he marched back to his original camp. (4) Four days later, Himmat Bahadur asked the French to come towards the *ahadi* of Nasir Jang's camp; thereupon La Touche marched towards Desur and reached the *ahadi* of the Nawab's camp, while yet there were a few hours still remaining in the night, *i.e.* in the early hours of the morning. (5) The French cannonade was answered by an attempt at firing by the *tōp-khana* of Nasir Jang's army. By that time the French had penetrated into the camp. The Nawab asked his men to get ready, but was informed by the jamadar of the Karch Chaukhi of the *fituri*, *i.e.* the rebellion, that had invited the French. The Nawab was advised to wait till morning when he would have the help of the Marathas and of Muhammad Ali. (6) Nasir Jang would not listen to his advice though it was repeated, but directed his mahout to go to the side of Himmat Bahadur and the jamadar to go to the *tōp-khana* in the *ahadi*. The mahout of the Nawab tried to persuade him to go to the camp of the Marathas or to that of Muhammad Ali and not towards Himmat Bahadur. The Nawab maintained that Himmat Bahadur was a loyal brother of his and insisted upon proceeding to his side; and he was accompanied by his brothers Salabat Jang, Basalat

Jang and Mir Nizam Ali Khan. (7) The Nawab accosted Himmat Bahadur, saying that there were a number of disloyal amirs and not one of them would come forward to attack the enemy; and thereupon, without answering a word, Himmat Bahadur shot the Nawab through his heart. He then jumped into the *howdah* of the Nawab, severed his head and raised it on a spear. Just then it was beginning to dawn. (8) Muhammad Ali who now rode into the scene fully armed, approached the Nawab's elephant, accompanied by Bakshi Ghazanfar Ali Khan. He saw the situation and the hoisting of the Nawab's head on the spear-head and the beating of the drums; he quietly resolved to flee to his stronghold of Trichinopoly, and marched away, with Ghazanfar Ali Khan, first to the south of Desur and thence north to Pennatur; and in the course of two *jāmams*, he had reached the jungles in the neighbourhood of Manalurpet. (9) The whole camp was thrown into confusion and the different captains and amirs had to shift to places where they would be secure from the general looting and fighting that was indulged in. La Touche and the amirs who remained with him mounted Muzaffar Jang on a *howdah* and proclaimed him the Wazir of the Deccan and beat the drum of elevation.

Professor Dubreuil has made a careful study, in his latest work '*Dupleix*' *Bicentenaire*, (March 1941), of the successive campings of Nawab Nasir Jang, of course on the basis mainly of French sources. At first, when Nasir Jang descended into the plains of Gingee in the summer of 1750, his encampment extended more than six leagues in circumference, from Tiruvakkarai on the west as far as Villianurmangalam on the east. There was a street well laid out for markets along its entire length. In that camp, the tents of Nasir Jang were at Valudāvur near the mosque to the north of the river of Gingee; a little further away was the tent where Muzaffar Jang was kept a prisoner and sideways were the camps of Shah Nawaz Khan and his Peshkar Ramdas. All round this central portion "the army was encamped in the fashion which the Marathas called 'in fortress'; that is to say, the tent of the Nawab should be at the centre of the camp and that the troops of the different generals should be posted in such a way that the camp formed a large circle. In order to prevent the quarrels inseparable from the differences in religion, the Marathas camped at one of the extreme ends of the camp and left a great space empty between them and the Moorish troops. (*Terraneau*, p. 140).

The advance guard was under Kazi Dayem; Moro Pandit was the captain of the forward troops of the Marathas; a *jamadar* of Chanda Sahib who had been captured by these two, early in March 1750, was the intermediary between the traitors in Nasir Jang's camp and Chanda Sahib in the front. Murari Rao, Janoji and Raja Ram Chander had all been bought over. Murari Rao was promised the territory of Tadpatri. Janoji was lured with gold and Raja Ram Chander was a friend of Janoji Nimbalkar. Moro Pant and Kazi Dayem were in the advance guard, close by Murari Rao. Janoji and Ramachandra Sen were encamped at the front centre; on the left wing were the Pathans and on the right wing, Muhammad Ali and the English. Of the three Pathan Nawabs, that of Savanur-Bankapur was a young man, eclipsed by the other two. Abdul Nabi Khan of Cuddapah was elderly and addicted to opium. He was a friend of the French, because of the fief of Chidambaram which was an *enclave* and belonged to him; and the governor of Chidambaram was in close communication with Dupleix. Abdul Nabi's younger brother had written in November 1749, five months before, to Chanda Sahib thus: "My elder brother, the Nawab of Cuddapah, is come, with the Nawab of Kandanur to oppose the devastations (of the army of

Nasir Jang) near Cumbum. He is your friend.”

The Nawab of Kurnool, Himayat Khan, had recently paid Nasir Jang eleven lakhs of rupees as *nazar*. He had complained that the expenses of maintaining an army, which he was asked to contribute to fight for Nasir Jang were excessive; and he had defeated a force sent against him by Nasir Jang, but had become reconciled to his suzerain, joined him on his southern march and got on well with him for some time. But the envoy of Himmat Khan who had expected to get the *jaghir* of Banganapalle from Nasir Jang in return for his services in effecting this reconciliation, grew angry with the Nizam and was said to have converted the Pathan Nawabs to the side of treason. This discontented envoy was probably Mir Sayfullah and is elsewhere called Sayfuddin. Himayat Khan was a young man of 27 or 28 years of age, “full of fire and courage. It was he who, so to speak led the gang.” On the right wing, that is to say, the other end of the camp, were Muhammad Ali and his lieutenants (Mahfuz Khan, his elder brother, Khair-uddin and Abdul Jalil his brothers-in-law, and Sampat Rao the former diwan of his father); lastly, to the extreme right (that is to say, to the south, in such a

way as to be easily in touch with Fort St. David), were the English troops of Cope.

Only Muhammad Ali was a sincere supporter of Nasir Jang. While this was the camp occupied by Nasir Jang in his first stay in the neighbourhood of Gingee, we do not know what exactly was the situation in the later camp of Nasir Jang, whether it was nearer Velimedupet or nearer Gingee. French evidence seems to be that the French troops attacked Nasir Jang's camp at Desur (*Ananda Ranga Pillai's Diary*, Vol. IX, p. 165). But Nasir Jang was at Velimedu, as is expressed by Narayana Kone. An English account of the event contained in a letter from Fort St. David, dated 30th December O.S. 1750, *i.e.*, 24 days after the event, speaks thus: "On the 6th December 1750 N.S. at about 2 o'clock in the morning the French having roused (awakened) the *rear guard* of Nasir Jang, the Nawabs of Kadapa and Kurnool under the pretext of coming to ask for their orders, approached the tent of Nasir Jang, and at the moment he mounted on his elephant, killed him with a gunshot, and severed his head which they showed at the end of a pike to all the army. It is said that his Premier Shah Nawaz was the soul of the conspiracy."

Dubreuil says that this account accords well with the French official version. "The

Viceroy immediately mounted on his elephant ; he ordered all his subordinate Nawabs to join him and to draw up their troops..... This was where the Nawab of Kurnool waited for him. He drew near as if to obey him ; but while the prince could not have the faintest suspicion of his design, he discharged a pistol on his head.” *

* The probability is that the Nawab's army extended over a large area, in the plain to the north-east of Gingee, beyond the river Chakravati, very likely in the direction of Vellimedu to the north-east and Sittamur and Villukam in the east. What is considered in the English version above quoted, as the *rear guard* of Nasir Jang has been evidently treated as the advance guard by the author of the *Rāhat Afza*. On this supposition many of the difficulties and inconsistencies presented by a comparative study of the details given by the *Rāhat Afza* and by the *Tuzak-i-Walajahi* and those given by Narayana Pillai and the French accounts can be reconciled.

If the generally accepted date for the martyrdom of Nasir Jang, *viz*, the night of the 17th Muharram 1164 A.H. is accurate, this corresponds to the 350th day of 1750 (16th December). This 16th December was a Wednesday. The calculation of the Muslims historian would be like this—“If a certain event happened on the night of Safar 3, 1069 (October 31, 1658), it may have happened between sunset and midnight on October 30, or between midnight and dawn on October 31” (page 5 of *Comparative Tables of Muhammadan and Christian Dates* by Sir T. W. Haig—Luzac & Co., 1932).

Hence, if the martyrdom of Nasir Jang took place on the night (before dawn) of Moharrum 17, 1164 A.H. it was on Wednesday December 16 (N.S.) (December 5, O.S.), 1750.

We have, from the generosity of Mon. A. Lehuraux a letter of M. Kerjean, nephew of Dupleix, who led the left wing of the French troops, writing a few hours after the tragedy, as follows.—

Camp of Nas'r Jang,

16, Dec. 1750, at 10 in the morning.

“Dear Uncle,

We left Fathpet yesterday at 5 hours of evening; and at 3 hours before daylight, we were before the camp of the Moors, who were sleeping profoundly. We gave them a cruel awakening by breaking into their camp in battle array; all fled and we pursued them right and left, front and rear, without ceasing, till 7 o'clock when we perceived your standard as well as several French flags appearing on the rocks, but we dared not give complete credence to these signs of friendship, when the head munshi (*grand ecrivain*) of Muzaffar Jang came to announce the death of Nasir Jang whose head had been cut off Mm. Very and Bussy are slightly wounded, we had only 6 or 7 soldiers wounded.”

This would fix the time of the tragedy in the early morning of the 16th December.

M. Lehuraux further gives valuable information as to the site of the tragedy. He bases his conclusion that the place was near Velimedu, first on the mention in Narayanan's *Chronicle* that the Nawab (Nasir Jang) had fixed his camp on the plain of Velimedu, at 10 *nāligai* distance to the north-east of Gingee, while the French army had encamped near Gingee. (10 *nāligai* distance = 13·8 miles). (2) La Touche, writing to Dupleix that the 2 armies were 4 leagues from each other, separated by an unfordable river. (4 French leagues being nearly 14 miles). The French camp at Fathpet (site of Nawab Sadatullah Khan's victory over Raja Desing) was one league in advance of their base at Gingee. Bussy, in accompanying Muzaffar Jang to the Deccan, in the course of the second day's march from Mailam (8 *kos*), traversed “the camp where Nasir Jang had his head cut off,” on the road to Wandiwash. We have also noted above (p. 503) Clive's traversing the spot on his march from Arcot to Fort St. David. On these data, Mon. Lehuraux

D.—The Fort under French occupation (1750-61)

Gingee became again the centre of interest during Clive's memorable siege of Arcot. We learn from a despatch of Governor Saunders, dated September 30, 1751 (O.S.), that Chanda Sahib's son with a body of 2,000 horse, some French and sepoys, marched from Gingee where he had taken shelter after raising the siege of Arcot, for the recapture of that place from Clive. The diversion on Arcot had given the English and the Nawab an easy possession of the place and even success in several skirmishes with the enemy; but the English lacked adequate forces for taking up an aggressive attitude, particularly cavalry; and though Muhammad Ali appointed his own collectors of revenue, it was felt that nothing could be done till he should send at least two or three thousand horse to Arcot.

In July 1752, when Muhammad Ali was besieged in Trichinopoly by the French, he conceived the idea that the English troops

has fixed the site at Puttanandal village, north of Vellimedu, the junction of Muhammad Ali's march in flight to Villupuram, Bussy's march from Perimbe to Wandiwash and Clive's from Timiri to Pedrapolur. This is supported by inference from Orme's location of the army of Nasir Jang at 16 miles from Gingee.

It is pertinent to point out that Dupleix erected, on the spot of Nasir Jang a very fine choultry to his 'memory.' Clive called it a "*monument of infamy.*"

could reduce Gingee and hence courted their assistance in his attempt to capture it. The English at Madras tried to help him in storming the fortress, notwithstanding the fact that Col. Lawrence advised against making the attempt, on the score of the improbability of success. Col. Lawrence knew that the place was very strong and well supplied with all manner of stores and garrisoned by 150 Europeans, beside sepoys and it would require a strong and numerous force to attack it. Moreover, no supply of cannon could then be expected from Fort St. David. These and other reasons determined Col. Lawrence to dissuade the Madras Governor from the attempt. His advice was tendered too late, as Major Kinneer, a man newly arrived from Europe, had already been despatched to Gingee on 23rd July 1752, with an army of 200 Europeans, 1,500 sepoys and 600 of the Nawab's cavalry. The next day Kinneer marched on Villupuram fort, twelve miles north of Tiruvati near Panruti; and the place immediately surrendered.

Dupleix, on hearing of its fall, determined to strike a blow for the recovery of the prestige of the French arms and directed his commandant at Gingee to defend his fort to the last extremity. Further, he sent 300

Europeans and 500 sepoy with seven field-pieces, who took possession of Vikravandi—which was situated midway between Pondicherry and Gingee and which commanded the road traversed by the English on their route to Gingee. Dupleix probably thought that the natural inaccessibility of the forts of Gingee was sufficient to enable a well-commanded garrison to beat off a force five times that of Kinneer, who was new to the country and the people.

Soon Major Kinneer arrived before Gingee and realised that his force was too small to reduce such a strong fortress enclosing a chain of mountains. However, on arrival at Gingee, he summoned the garrison to surrender. The French officer commanding the place answered with civility that he kept it for the King of France, that he would not surrender it and that he was determined to defend it. Kinneer was appalled at its strength and hesitated to invest the place with his small force. Moreover, the two pieces of battering cannon which he expected from Fort St. David did not arrive in time.

His forces were, however, reinforced at Tiruvati with a body of 300 Europeans, 500 sepoy and others.

The French were placed in a strong situation at Vikravandi which was surrounded by a river and hence they were able to cut off all communications. Kinneer boldly attacked the enemy, but at last fell down wounded. The English sepoy's grew disheartened and began to retreat. Poor Kinneer was so much affected by his ill luck, that although he soon recovered from his wounds, his vexation and disappointment brought on an illness which cost him his life.

Thus ended the expedition of Kinneer to Gingee in 1752.¹

¹ Orme (*History of Indostan*, Vol. I, pp. 253–254) thus describes this battle:—"The English marched directly to the enemy who appeared at first drawn up on the outward bank of the rivulet and recrossed it with precipitation. The English, elated with the imagination of their panic, advanced to the bank, and leaving their field-pieces behind, began the attack with the fire of their musketry only. The enemy answering it, both from musketry and field-pieces, and under shelter, suffered little loss, and did much execution. The company of English Coffres were first flung into disorder by carrying off their wounded as they dropped, and soon after took flight; they were followed by the sepoy's; and Major Kinneer in this instant receiving a wound which disabled him, the Europeans began to waver likewise. The enemy perceiving the confusion, detached 100 of their best men, amongst which were 50 volunteers, who, crossing the rivulet briskly, advanced to the bank. The vivacity of this unexpected motion increased the panic, and only 14 grenadiers, with two ensigns, stood by the colours; these indeed defended them bravely, until they were rejoined by some of the fugitives, with whom they retreated in order; and the French, satisfied with their success, returned to the village, having, with very little

The English troops retreated to Tiruvati; and the enemy, after quitting Vikravandi, recaptured the fort of Villupuram which they demolished. Dupleix was greatly elated by this success and strengthened the French army in the field with further reinforcements. The French forces encamped to the north of Fort St. David close to the bound-hedge. Thereupon the English and the Nawab's troops quitted Tiruvati and took their post at Semmandalam, a redoubt within the bound-hedge, three miles to the west of Fort St. David; and the French were even bold enough to capture some English troops that were coming by *masula boats* from Madras. This was the situation before the battle of Bahur; and Dupleix felt for the moment great satisfaction at having restored French prestige to some extent.

loss to themselves, killed and wounded 40 of the English battalion, which suffered in this action more disgrace than in any other that had happened during the war: Major Kinneer was so affected by it, that although he recovered of his wound, his vexation brought on an illness, of which he some time after died."

"The greatest part of the town was encircled by a rivulet, which serving as a ditch, was defended by a parapet, formed of the ruins of old houses, and interrupted at proper intervals to give play to the cannon. The outward bank was in many parts as high as the parapet, and that part of the village which the rivulet did not bound, might be easily entered; but the English, neglecting to reconnoitre before they began the attack, lost the advantages which they might have taken of these circumstances."

To return to the fortunes of Gingee :—

Gingee remained firmly in French possession until after the fall of Pondicherry to Sir Eyre Coote in January 1761. It was in this epoch that the French added their own fortifications to the place. Even now there can be seen the remains of the quarters which they built and the almost intact Royal Battery on the rocky knoll in the line between Chandrayandurg and Krishnagiri. “The aggressively modern gate-posts outside the Pondicherry and Arcot gates, the curious little brick and chunam sentry-boxes (shaped like pepper-castors) and the brick embrasures which may be seen all about the fortifications would seem to have also been their work.”¹ Gingee served the French as a base of resistance during the operations of Count de Lally in the Carnatic between the battle of Wandiwash and the fall of Pondicherry. From Wandiwash the French army fled through Chetpat to Gingee and from that place shortly retreated into Pondicherry. Coote took Chetpat on the 29th January 1760, Arcot on the 10th February

¹ It was from the Venkataramanaswami Temple that the French took away the tall monolithic pillars which were planted round Dupleix's statue at Pondicherry. Perhaps the French were responsible for the roadway which leads straight from the Pondicherry Gate to the Sadatullah Khan's Mosque.

and Perumukkal* on the 3rd March, while Tiruvannamalai capitulated to a detachment under Captain Stephen Smith. The fort of Alamparva surrendered to Coote on the 12th March and the port of Karikkal was surrendered to an expedition sent by sea under the command of Major Monson. On the previous day, *i.e.*, the 4th of April, Villupuram was taken by a detachment of sepoy under Captain Wood; on the 19th Chidambaram fell (with its garrison of 6 officers and 46 men) into the hands of Monson; on the same day a detachment of sepoy occupied Cuddalore without serious opposition, while three days previously Valudāvur had surrendered to Coote who had resumed command after a short period of illness. Vriddhachalam likewise capitulated on the 27th April. Lally now solicited the aid of Haidar Ali, who ordered Makhdum Ali, then engaged in the conquest of the Baramahal, to proceed to Pondicherry; and that chief marched from Baramahal to Tyagadurg. This place and Gingee alone were now in French possession in the *subah* of Arcot. Makhdum Ali's victory over Major Moore near Tiruvati was counter-balanced by Coote's capture of the fort of Villiyanur, just as Lally was marching

* Lally attempted to reinforce O'Kennedy, its captain, but could not do so. So the *pettah* (outside the fort) was taken on the 3rd and the rock fort on the 6th of March.

out from Pondicherry to relieve it. Coote settled down before Pondicherry during August between Perimbe and Villiyanur and invested the place at its bound-hedge limits which extended in a curve of 15 miles round the town and had been strengthened by four large redoubts, namely, the Madras, Vellore, Villiyanur and Ariancopang Redoubts. Coote abandoned an attack on the Ariancopang fort, which he had projected, owing to the protest of Major Monson. But he repulsed a surprise attack made on the British camp by Lally on the 4th September. Four days later, the of Valudāvur and Villiyanur Redoubts were taken, the latter by Major Joseph Smith.

Within a week, the French withdrew from the Ariancopang Redoubt after partially blowing it up. Coote who had now rejoined the camp, took the Madras Redoubt on the 1st of October, with the help of Joseph Smith. It was retaken by the French the same night; but “Subadhar Coven Naig” formed up the sepoys who had been driven out, and retook it with great gallantry soon afterwards. In October, Coote allowed women and children to be evacuated from Pondicherry; and in the next month Lally turned out all the native inhabitants. Throughout December cannon-ading went on, with the fleet co-operating. On the 5th January 1761, the St. Thomas Redoubt

erected by Lally opposite that of Ariyancopang, was captured, but lost the next day. Lally's attempts to secure Maratha help failed; and Pigot, the Governor of Madras, now arrived on the scene. On the 10th January fresh batteries were opened; trenches were commenced on the 13th; on the 16th Lally surrendered and the garrison laid down their arms; and Coote's Grenadiers took possession of the Villianur Gate. The British flag was hoisted on Fort St. Louis on the following day, under a salute of 1,000 guns. A huge quantity of arms and ammunition were taken, besides 500 pieces of cannon and 100 "mortars and howits." The entire fortifications of Pondicherry were completely demolished; and orders were given for the immediate reduction of the other French settlements in India. Tyagadrug capitulated to Major Preston on the 4th of February, 1761; five days later Mahe fell into the hands of Major Hector Munro. The surrender of Gingee to Captain Stephen Smith on the 6th April following, left "not a single ensign of the French nation allowed by the authority of its government in any part of India."* The major part of the English army in the Carnatic was cantoned in Cuddalore, Pondicherry and Madras, by February 1761. One

* H. F. Murland : *Baillie ki Paltan* (1930)—p. 14.

detachment under Captain Smith was sent to blockade Gingee, and another under Major Preston was detailed to invest Tyagadrug. Everywhere else, the province was tranquil; and in the last week of the month the British squadron left Pondicherry for Bombay.

Captain Stephen Smith at Gingee and its Fall into English hands.

After the fall of Pondicherry in January to Sir Eyre Coote's forces, Gingee and Tiagar (Tyagadrug in the present Kallakurichi taluk of the South Arcot District) alone remained in the hands of the French. Hence Coote decided to capture them also. He sent an convoy of military stores to Major Preston, who was blockading Tiagar. He also detached eight companies of sepoys under the command of Captain Stephen Smith to invest Gingee.

Captain Smith, as soon as he encamped before Gingee, summoned Macgregor, its commanding officer, to surrender. Macgregor retaliated by saying that, even if he had brought 100,000 men, the forts could not be reduced in three years. The forts of Gingee were then surrounded by a strong wall, buttressed with stone-towers connected with one another, which measured 12,000 yards or

nearly $6\frac{3}{4}$ miles in length.* The French, who regarded the forts on the mountains to be impregnable, had for defence only 150 Europeans. To passes and Coffres, 600 sepoys and 1,000 Colleries, *i.e.*, natives of the adjoining hills whom they called by that name.

Smith was encamped in the eastern portion of the area. The French had constructed, during their occupation, the Royal

* The *pettah* outside the wall had a protecting mud wall. The inward town was in the centre of the triangular walled enclosure connecting the three hills and stood on higher ground. There was the connecting stone wall referred to above, which continued up the mountains and surrounded the three hills. “ Besides this exterior enclosure, the interior and higher defences run double round the two forts to the east ; and the great mountain to the west (Rajagiri), which is the principal fortification, has four enclosures, one below another, towards the town in the valley.....The wall on the east side of the valley extends 1,200 yards from the Mountain of St. George on the right to the English Mountain on the left, and nearly in the middle passeth along the side of a heap of rocks on which the French had raised a work which they called the Royal Battery, under which, on the right, towards the mountain of St. George stood a gateway opposite to the outward *pettah* in the plain ; but the *pettah* extended only from this mountain to the rocks of the battery.” (Orme. Vol. II (4th ed.) *pp.* 728-9)—see also Plan of Geesee on p. 151 of Vol. I showing :

- (1) *E*, (outer *pettah*)
- (2) *h, h, h*, (French garrisons)
- (3) *a*, gate of the 2nd wall leading to the inner fort.
- (4) *e* Pondicherry Gate in the outer stone-wall and the walls connecting and enclosing the three mountains and also the defence walls and gates of the Rajagiri citadel.

Battery between the St. George's Mountain and the English Mountain. Captain Stephen Smith was informed by several persons about the real state of the garrison and the defences of Gingee. On the night of 2nd February 1761, he marched from his camp, with 600 sepoys in two divisions, of which the former carried a sufficient number of scaling ladders, while the latter were kept for support when called for. They crept unpercieved through the *pettah* which was to the east of the Royal Battery and gained the road leading from the Pondicherry Gate to Sadatullah Khan's Mosque. The guards at the Pondicherry Gate raised an alarm; but Smith drove them from their posts at the point of the bayonet and opened the gate to let in another body of 400 men which brought his total strength to 600. With these forces he captured the Royal Battery, taking possession of both the gateways of the outer wall.

Then he waited for day-break to drive the enemy troops out of the town. Some had already fled to St. George's Mountain and others ran to the English Mountain. The majority of them went into the inner lower fort at the foot of Rajagiri from where they began to fire on the English troops below. At night-fall they retired from the inner fort to the higher defences.

On the intelligence of this success, 1,000 more sepoys were sent to Stephen Smith. A jamadar-deserter offered to lead a party, by a path he knew, to surprise the fort on St. George's Mountain. He was trusted; and at the next night-fall, 200 sepoys marched under his guidance and scaled the defences unperceived. They siezed eight Europeans, while the others escaped to the enclosure below. In the morning an officer came down to capitulate, but demanded very liberal terms.

Captain Smith refused to accept the surrender* A large stock of provisions was found in the fort of this mountain, from which it was concluded that the remaining forts were also well provided. There was no hope that "either of these fortresses could be taken by surprise and still less by open attack." They trusted to time for success, "which was not be expected either from force or fortune."

On the every day when the Mountain of St. George surrendered to Captain Smith, *i.e.*, 4th February 1761, the important fortress of Tiagar (or Tyagadrug) capitulated to Major Preston after a severe blockade and

* He knew that he could capture them by sending more men up the rock, demanded their surrender at discretion and got 42 Europeans and 70 sepoys.

bombardment of 65 days. Mahe had surrendered to Major Munro on February 13, 1761; and the news of the surrender had reached Madras on the 3rd of March. Gingee seems to have presented greater obstacles than either of these two places to the English attacking forces.

However, on the 5th April 1761, Smith received a proposal from Macgregor, the French commander at Gingee, stating that he would capitulate, if his garrison were allowed all the honours of war. The rank and file of the Europeans had to be sent to Europe as prisoners liable to exchange. The officers were to be permitted to retire to any of the neutral European settlements on the coast, where they were to live at the expense of the English Company who were also to defray their passage to Europe.

300 English sepoy had already died in the town and in the St. George's Mountain, "from the peculiar inclemency of the air which has always been deemed the most unhealthy in the Carnatic in so much that the French who never until lately kept more than 100 Europeans here, had lost 1,200 men in the 10 years during which it had been in their possession." Captain Stephen Smith therefore readily accepted the terms and in

the afternoon, the garrison marched out of the two mountains.* There were 12 officers, 100 rank and file, Europeans and Topasses, 40 lascars of artillery, 30 cannon and some mortars.

The fall of Gingee on 5th April 1761 terminated the long contested hostilities between the two rival European powers in the Carnatic. The French lost their last possession in the Carnatic. In order to retard as much as possible their re-establishment in power at the conclusion of peace, the demolition of the fortifications of Pondicherry and other places was ordered immediately, at the suggestion of George Pigot, the Governor of Madras.

Gingee regained for a time its strategic and military importance, alas! for the last time in its fateful history, in 1780 A.D. during Haidar Ali's invasion of the Carnatic by the Chngamah pass, with a force of 90,000 men and helped by some able French officers like Puymorin and Lally the Younger (July 1780). Soon Ensign Macaulay was sent with a company of English forces to assist the Nawab's garrison at the fort. Haidar's men appeared before the place and easily carried

* Orme: *History of Indostan*: Volume II, pp. 728 to 733.

the lower fort by assault, while a European in the Nawab's service left his post without firing a shot. Macaulay had to retire to the top of Rajagiri, while the rest of the garrison mutinied, demanded that he should surrender and even threatened to assassinate him. Macaulay was compelled to capitulate; and he did so on the condition (which was never kept by Haidar) that he should be sent to Madras. But he was soon despatched a prisoner to Seringapatam. According to a contemporary diary (the Journal of one Sergeant Smith) "they (Haidar's men) did not leave him a shirt." † That was how Macaulay failed in his attempt to resist Haidar's attack on Gingee (November 1780). ‡

† Wilks: *History of South India and Mysore*, Vol. I, Page 449; *The South Arcot Gazetteer*, Vol. I, pp. 355-356.

‡ Major Innes Munro (in his work—*A Narrative of the Military Operations on the Coromandal Coast*: London 1789) says that soon after Haidar's descent by the Changamah pass, "the forts of Trinomaly, Chitaputt, Arne, Gingee, Chillumbrum, Cavare-punk and Carrangooly, etc., were all given up according to agreement? (.) so that in less than fourteen days he possessed a chain of our frontier garrisons that completely secured the safety of all his convoys from the Mysore country."—(p. 134).

Wilks remarks that "not one native officer entrusted by Mohammad Ali with the defence of a fortress, would be faithful to the general cause, and it became an urgent consideration to commit them to English officers." To four important forts were European officers sent, Ensign Allan to Udayarpalayam, Ensign Macaulay to Gingee, Lieutenant Parr to Carnaticgadh, and another officer to

From the close of the Second Mysore War, Gingee has been free from the ravages and anarchy of war, but subject to desolation and decay.

Wandiwash. Allan had to defend the place against its own poligar; and Parr had to escape after considerable hardship and the humiliation of seeing the fort sold by its *killedar* to the enemy.

CONCLUSION

Ever since Gingee came under the British control, it lost its historical importance. During the height of the Napoleonic scare in Europe, Mr. Garrow, the Collector of South Arcot, recommended to the Board of Revenue, in 1803, the demolition of the Gingee forts, in view of their proximity to Pondicherry. His recommendation was not fortunately carried out.

Even though Gingee is now a small village and presents a desolate aspect, with its ruined redoubts, temples and granaries, it attracts a large number of visitors who wonder at the ponderous nature of its fortifications. The place is well worth a visit even to-day, as it has got a fascinating interest for the student of history. We may fittingly conclude by quoting again the following disheartening reflection on the present state of Gingee. "It is a melancholy reflection for the historian, that what was once a scene of bustling animation and dazzling military pomp, can boast at present of only a few humble habitations with a handful of peaceful agriculturists. Where once chargers pranced in martial array, the bullocks drag the plough-share, goaded by a half-naked

farmer and the spider weaves its web where rulers once sat in state and administered the affairs of the realm. But the memory of one of the brave chieftains of the line is preserved even to this day in every town and village of South India. The wandering minstrel sings to groups of villagers, under the banyan tree of the heroism of Raja Desing, of how he loved and fought and fell." *

* C. S. Srinivasachari : *History of Gingee* (Madras 1912) p. 21.

INDEX

INDEX

References are to Pages and Foot Notes.

A

- Abdulhai Khan, Mir. Samsam-ul-Mulk, his account of Nasir Jang's death 494N.
- Abdul Hakim Khan, 497.
- Abdul Jalil, brother-in-law of Muhammad Ali, 512.
- Abdul Karim Hayat Khan, an officer of Gingee 438.
- Abdulla Khan, his Mysore expedition 157.
- Abdulla Khan, Khaja, the subhedar of Arcot 460, 461, the Nazim of the Carnatic 461, his death 461, 462.
- Abdulla Khan, the Bijapuri governor of Gingee and his surrender to Shivaji 221.
- Abdul Nabi Khan, his territory plundered 408 & N, his strife with Sādat Tiyyar Khan of Gingee 440.
- Abdul Nabi Khan, Nawab of Cuddapah 496, his forces 498N, 510. his brother 511.
- Abul Hasan, Sultan of Golkonda, his help to Shivaji 234, and the latter's betrayal 234&N.
- Abeille, a French engineer, 489N1.
- Achyutappa Nayak of Tanjore, 77, 201N, 203.
- Achyutaraya of Vijayanagar, his consecration of Govindaraja shrine for a second time 79N, 87, his generals 87, 123N, 126.
- Adaipalam 126N.
- Adil Shah, Sultan of Madura 57.
- Adil Shah of Bijapur 174, 191N, his government 211, capture of 212.
- Āditya Chola I, mentioned 27.
- Ādondai Chakravarti, the Chola 37, overthrew the Kurumbas 39, 64.

Ādoni 358N, 469.

Afghan chiefs, 496, Nawabs 498.

Africa, 70N.

Afzal Khan, the Bijapur general, 168, 183.

Agaram tank 85N. Agaram village 100 identified with
Krishnapuram 100, 203.

Agastiya, The Sage, 58, 59.

Agra, the Mughal court at 179, Shivaji's visit to 256,
367, escape of the Mughal Prince from 446.

Ahmad Shah, Emperor, 489N1.

Ajit Naire, 298.

Akalkot, Jaghir of 442N.

Akilāndēsvari shrine at Jambai, 89.

Akkaṇṇa, his presents to Shivaji, 213, 234N.

Alaf Khan Panni, his son killed, 460.

Ālamgīr, the Padshah 410N.

Alamparva fort, surrender of 521.

Ālampūdi grant of Virūpaksha 51 to 53, its importance
54, 55, 71, 72, 82.

Alau'd-din Sikandar Shah of Madura, 57.

Allan, Ensign 530N.

Ali Dōst Khan, Nawab. 450, 451, his justice 452, his death
456, 460.

Ali Mardan Khan, the faujdar of Conjeevaram 294,
attacked and captured 298, 299, his release
299, 305, 306, 310, 325N2.

Ali Naqi, son of the killedar of Wandiwash, 486.

Ali Qadir, brother-in-law of Ali Mardan Khan, 299.

Allahabad, 78.

Allanganattam. 385.

Alup Singh, Desing's nephew, his son performed the
obsequies of Desing 410N, 433.

Amanulla Khan, his forces 498N.

- Ambika Bai, wife of Harji Rajā, 252.
and Shivaji's daughter 238, 263, & 264.
- Amboji Pant, his grant to the English, 243.
- Ambur, 449N. battle of 468, 485.
- Amir Jahan, 337N, 343, his letter, 344, 346.
- Amir Khan, appointed to the Bijapuri Carnatic, 358N.
- Amīr-ul-Umara, Nawab, 335.
- Ammākūḷam, tanks in Gingee and Vriddhachalam, built
by Mangammal of Gingee, 88N.
- Amrit Rao (Ameert Rao) 329N1.
- Ānaikūḷam Tank 8.
- Ānandagiri, original name of Rajagiri 2, 85N, new name
of Kamalagiri 31.
- Ānanda Kōn, chief of Gingee 28&N, his relations with
Gingee 31, his victories 31, 33N1, his race
68, called a Dhangar 83N.
- Ānanda Ranga Pillai, Wasarat Vijaya. Dupleix's dubash
465, 466, honours conferred by Muzaffar
Jang 469, his Diary 473, referred to 489N1,
500.
- Ananta, legendary serpent 12.
- Ananta Das, Raja, at Fort St. David, 468.
- Anantārya, author of *Prapannāmṛtam*, 61.
- Anegundi, 41, Krishna Raya of 83N, 358N.
- Anglo-French wars 358N.
- Anka Bhūpala, Kalahasti chief, 93, 131N.
- Anka Damarla, author of *Ushaparināyam* 94.
- Annāji Pant, Shivaji's minister, 227, 230N, 234N.
- Annāmalai Chettiar, Raja Sir. his renovation of the
Govindaraja Shrine 123N.
- Antwerp, 12 Years' Truce of, 119.
- Anwaru-d-dīn Khan, his conducts toward the Madura
Prince 454N, his machinations 462, appointed

faujdar of the Carnatic 462, 463, suspected 464, his return to Arcot 465, and troubles 465, his treatment of the foreigners 466, his march towards the south 466, his return to oppose Muzaffar Jang 468, his death in the battle of Ambur 468.

Anwaru-d-din Khan Muhammad Ali, his forces, 498N.

Appa Naik of Gingee, 83, 91, 151.

Appayya Dikshita, his patron, 103, 126N.

Appayya Nayak, 150.

Aquaviva, Rev. Fr. Claudius, referred to 95N.

Arabs, The, attacked the English 242, fight with 421N.

Arasama Nayak, Velayudha, his claim of territory from the English 325N2.

Arasama Nayak, identified with Yachama Nayak 319, 320.

Aravidu family, 123N, growth of religious controversy 126N, 138.

Arcot, as head-quarters of the Carnatic in 1716, 21, its Commissioner 28N, 30, taluk 51, district 83N, defence of 328, 337N, 348, 358&N, arrival of harkars from the Padshah 410N, Mughal headquarters at 437, 438&N, Mughal prince at 446, subah of 447N, 449N, 450, Chanda Sahib's return to 452N, 456, plunder of 456, Arcot Gate of Gingee 520.

Arcot, Nawabs of 8, 12, conquest of 250, 360, subah of 360N, 365, 368, 417, 421, Nawab's desire to dispossess Desing 422, 423, 424, his attack on Gingee 425, his army 427, his desire of conquest 432, 433, 435, 439, Chanda Sahib's plan to become the Nawab of 454, 455, Safdar Ali as the Nawab 457, 458&N, 459, 460, 461, 463&N, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 471, 473, 474, 475, ordered to be captured by Dupleix 476, 482, Nawab of 485, 493,

494&N, 500, 502, 503, 513N, siege of 515,
516, English capture of 521, 522.

Ariançopang, blown up 522, 523.

Armagaon, 109N, 147N.

Armenian merchants, 299, sent to the Mughal court
325N2.

Armittu Pillai 374N.

Arni, 58, Raja's army fled to 179, Maratha defeat at 328,
Sadatullah Khan's arrival at 410N, 425,
449N, 530N.

Arulāla Perumal Temple of Kanchi, 128.

Arungor of Du Jarric 100.

Aryāvarta, The, 78.

Asadulla Khan, Mir. killedar of Chetpat, 457.

Asad Khan in the south 247, 248, father of Zulfikar
Khan 286, 292, sent to Gingee 292, 293&N2,
met Prince Kam Bhaksh 293N2, 295, 301,
302, 304, 307, 309, his peace terms to Raja
Ram 309, 310, 311, fined by the Emperor
311, restored to Emperor's favour 312, 317,
320N, 325N2, his son 351, 430.

Asaf Jah, Nizamu'l-Mulk, his independance 440, his part
in winning the Mahratta leaders 441, his
with-holding of *chauth* 441, his winning over
of Sambhaji and treaty of Shevgaon 441, his
plans 442N, his enmity to Shahu 442N,
and hostility 443, his march to the south 443,
444, granted concessions to the Carnatic
Nawab 445, his return 445, his settlement
of the Carnatic revenues 445N, conferred
honour upon Sadatullah Khan 446, his rati-
fication of Sadatullah Khan's appointment
447, his order on the English construction
of a fort at Madras 447, 457, 459. march into
the Carnatic and settlement of the affairs

at 460, 461, left Arcot 461, 462&N, his confirmation of the faujdari of the Carnatic on Anwaru-d-din 462-3, 464, his death 466.

Asia, 67N.

Askar Ali Khan, the Golkonda governor 288.

Askar Khan, Nawab of the Carnatic 325N2.

Asuppur fortress 34, Asappur 356, 357.

Asuras, The. 7, 59.

Attock, 254N.

Aurangabad 356, 357, Nizam's capital changed from 442N. 489N1.

Aurangzib Viceroy of Deccan, his help sought by Sriranga III, 175, 176, 191N, Shivaji's fear of 225, siege of Golkonda 246, 247, 248, his hatred of Sambhaji 251, attacked him 255, appointed Zulfikar Khan to conquer the South 272N1, 286, 288, his son 292, 293, his rumoured death 301, 302, 303N2, 309, 311, 312, 313N, 317, 320&N, 329, his order of the siege of Gingee 330N, his reinforcements 332, 334, 341, his appointments 353, grant of Gingee to Sarup Singh 354, 360, 361, 364, appointment of Sadatullah Khan 365&N, 366, his death 367, his *farman* to Desing's father 422, 423, 435, his times referred to 438N, 481N1.

Avalkondai, killa of 449N.

Avesta, The. its discovery of 70N.

Āvūr, 51.

Aya, The Great: of Gingee his influence 114, 115, his assurance to the Dutch 115, blamed by the Dutch 116, Dutch negotiations with him 117. Tiere Wangaleya, governor of Tondaimandalam, 117 to 119.

Ayyankulam, tank 129.

Ayyappa, Damarla. his rule, 94.

Azam, Prince : 2nd son of Aurangzib, posted to Cuddapah
311.

Aziz Khan, 314.

B

Babaji, the Bhonsle free-booter 266.

Bābuji Nayak, 455.

Badē Sahib, brother of Chanda Sahib, 452. 456.

Badshābad, Bijapuri name for Gingee, 23.

Bahadur Shah, troubled on all sides 367.

Bahlol Khan, Rustam-i-Zaman, the Bijapur general 180,
his friendship with Shivaji 211, his capture
of the Adil Shah 212, 215N, 218N 233.

Bahmani Sultans 181N.

Bahur, battle of 520.

Bailpur, see Villupuram, 494N1.

Bāji Rao Peshwa, in the South, 441, 443, his death 457,
Balachetti chatram 489N1.

Balaghat, Bijapur Karnatak 169.

Baliah Sri. a member of the Madras Provincial Service 7.

Ballala III (See Vallalaraya) 44, his death 44, his defeat
at Kannanur 45, his death 46, founded
Virupakshapattana and planted a pillar of
victory 46, his door-keeper Kampana 57.

Ballala IV *alias* Vira Virupaksha Ballala 42, or
Hampaya Wodayar 42, 45, sister married
to Vallappar 45&N, his fight 45, 47.

Ballal Chitnis, Khando, son of Shivaji's private secretary
253, 254.

Bandipalayam, 386, scuffle between the English and
Sarup Singh's men at 400.

Bangalore, Mussalman capture of 156, chief of 168, 169, 246, 247, taken by the Mughals 247, Raja Ram arrived at 257, fugitives at 258N1, fall of 261, 358N, Maratha outpost 442N.

Banganapalle, 511.

Banjaras, the caravans of : 313.

Bankapur, 358N See also Savanur.

Bantam. 177N.

Baqir Ali Khan, killēdār of Vellore and son of Ghulam Ali Khan, chosen as the Nawab of Arcot 438N, 450, 452.

Baramahal, The, under Mysore, 155, 171, conquest of 522.

Barbosa, referred to, 194, 196, 200N.

Baroda, 191 N.

Baron, Monsienr, 218N.

Barradas, *Mauuel* referred to, 133, 137, Provincial of Malabar 138, 141, his account of the murder of Ranga 141N, 142 to 145.

Barwell, Mr. Charles, 270, 279.

Basalat Jang, 487N1, accompanied Nasir Jang 508.

Basātin-i-Salātin, referred to, 183, 184, 191 & N.

Basavapattanam, 155, 168.

Bassu, mother of Daud Khan, 360N.

Bassur, The Dutch Factory at, 421N.

Batavia, 178.

Bavanashi. The, 213.

Bavdekar, Ramachandra Nilākanta (Pant Amatya) 253.

Bednore (Bednoor) 257, 258N2. Rani of 258N2, 358N, Desing's arrival at 410N, Raja troubled by the Marathas 410N, 421, an account of 421N, 422, tributes exacted by the Marathas 441, 445N.

Belgaum, Maratha outpost 442N.

- Bellary district 41, 358N, Mahratta outpost, in 442N.
- Bengal, The Royal Asiatic Society of. 67N, 70N, Bay of 108, 325N2, 431.
- Bentinck, Lord William. Governor of Madras, 15, 28N, 31, 68.
- Benyon Mr. 401, 403.
- Berar, jaghir offered to the Marathas 441.
- Bernier, 70N.
- Bhairava Nayaka, brother of Surappa Nayaka, 90.
- Bhawani, Goddess 254&N.
- Bhalleraj* or spear-rule, 266.
- Bhimsen, 18th cent. annalist referred to 3, his account of the siege of Gingee 305, 310, 311, 321, 229, 331, his date for the fall of Gingee 343, 344, 346.
- Bhonsla line in Tanjore, 442N.
- Bhūlōka Devendran, a Chola chief 27.
- Bhūpatiraya Udayar of Wandiwash, 41.
- Bhuvanagiri, capture of, 146.
- Bider Bakht. Prince, 328.
- Bidnoor (Bednore) 230N.
- Bijapur, governors of Gingee 16N, 23, Nayaks' association with 82N, 153N, invasion of 155, Sultan of and his peace with the Mughals 155, first Mysore invasion and treaty 156, subsequent Mysore invasions 157, 159, alliance sought by Golkonda 164, attack on Sriranga 164, Bijapur troops take Gingee 165, war with Golkonda 165, 166, 167, forces 169, 170, alliance with Shaji 170, army's success 171, 172, alliance sought by Madura 173, conquest of Gingee 173-4, Sriranga's peace with 175, help to Mir Jumla recalled 176, Raya's attempt at alliance with 179, its help to the

Raya in overthrowing Golkonda 180, final occupation of Gingee 180, its success in Gingee 180, attack on Tanjore 180, its victorious return 181, its possessions in the Carnatic 181N, its siege of Gingee 183, its plunder of Gingee 184, rulers of 185, army's plunder of the south and return to capital 186, date of the conquest of Gingee 186, its hold on Gingee 188, 190, revenues due from the south 191, 206, fortifications made at 206, factions in the court 210. Shivaji's plunder of 211, Shivaji's offer to 213, 215N, 217, 218N, 225, 226, Shivaji's expedition to 227, 229, 230, court factions 232, 234N, fall of 245, 251, fall of 260, Raja Ram's attempt to retake it 264, 320N, conquest of 325N2, Adil Shahis of 358N, subhadar of 460, commander of 481N1.

Bishun Gingee (Vishnu Gingee) 13, 14, identified with Singavaram 14.

Bitter, Jacob de, 112, 113, 117.

Black Town, The Old 361N, repairs done to 447N, 458N.

Boddam, Charles, 503.

Bombay Presidency, 130 222, 230N, 242, 325N2, 524.

Bomma Raja, 63, 410N.

Bomma Reddi of Kalahasti 73.

Bordeaux 70N.

Bourgonjie, Pieter Gerritsz, at Tegnapatam 113 to 115, 116, 117, his contract with the Aya 117.

Brahmans in the court of Gingee 99.

Branfill, Col. referred to, 5, 15.

Brazil, 70N.

Brenier, French commander at Gingee 479N.

Brown, C.P., his Collection 67N.

Brown, Dr. Samuel, his journey to Gingee to get a *farman* 325N2.

Bukkaraja I, 48, 51, 52, 55, 71.

Bundelas The. their part in the siege of Gingee 336&N, 308, followers 316, 333, 410N.

Bundelkhand. Raja of 354, 410N. 420, 421, 422.

Burhan ibn Hasan or Burhanu'd-din, his account of Daud Khan 363&N, referred to 452, 481.

Bussy, Dupleix's order to 471N, 476&N, his attack on Gingee 477, 479N, his success in capturing Gingee 479N, his advance on Gingee, 481N1 his march referred to 483N1, accompanied Muzaffar Jang to the Deccan 513N, his march 513N.

C

Caesar, his success in Spain recalled 222.

Calcutta, 67N, 447, 489N1.

Calicut 70N, Zamorin of 108.

Canara coast of 421N.

Canarins, The. (and the Korumbins) 38.

Carnatic, the (Karnataka) Sivaji's expedition into the 16N, Carnatic wars 20N, 32, Krishnaraya's expedition into 73, revenues from 74&N, sources for its history 75N, 81, date of Krishnaraya's expedition 81, 82, emperor of 106N, events of 147N, country 166, 171 ruler of 174, Mir Jumla's conquests in 177, 180, Golkonda supremacy over 181N, 185, Sivaji's expedition into 188, its revenue 190, inscriptions 196, Haidar's expedition into 202, its faujdar 206, 207, coast of 210, expedition 211, Sivaji's expedition into 214, 215N, 217, 218, captulations in 222, Sivaji's possessions in 223, his short

stay in 224, its originator 226, plan for a Hindu Raj in 228, 229, 230, 232, affairs in 233, 234&N, 237, 238N, Sambhaji sent his garrisons to 245, 247, 248, 254, 257, Maratha army in 261, The Mughals in 286, 287, 292, 315, Hyderabad-Carnatic 320N, Nawab of 325N2, 332, 336, faujdar of 338, 348, 351, 352, 353, faujdar of 356, first Nawab of 358, divisions of 358N, Payenghat; its boundaries 358N, Hyderabad-Carnatic its extent 358N, Bijapur Carnatic 358N, 360&N, Karnatakghad 365N, 366, Nawab of 368, account of 410N, faujdar of 424, administration of 434, Nawab of 438N, 440 *chauth* from 441, Maratha affairs in 442N, Muhammadan sway established in 442N, tribute from 443, faujdar of 444, 445N, killas of 447, Payenghat region of the Carnatic 449&N, Maratha advance upon 455, Nabobs of 458N, 459, 460, revenues of 461, 462, 465, 467, Amir of 469, 471N, 475, 477, 484, 485, 487N1, 521, 524, 529, 530&N1.

Carrangooly (Karunguzhi) 530N.

Castenheda, referred to 194.

Cateck, appointment of the Nawab of, 350.

Catuir of Nuniz, identified with Chittoor 74N.

Cauvery, The, 232.

Ceylon, 163.

Chakkilidrug called Chamar Tikri, 3, 12, 14, fortification of 88N, 330, 449N.

Chakrakulam tank, 8, 10, 11, 290, 433.

Chakraperumal temple 88N, 410N.

Chakrapuri, Sivaji's camp at, 215.

Chakravati, The, 215, 494N, 495, 498, 499, 513N.

Chalchiram, treasurer 356.

Chalukyass, The. 39.

Champaraya 50, see also **Sambuvaraya**.

Chamaraja Udayar, grandson of **Raja Udayar**. his conquest of **Chennapatna** 155.

Chamber, Mr. 178.

Chanda Sahib, his release from the **Maratha** prison 421N, son-in-law of **Dost Ali** 452, his expedition 452, his rise to prominence 452N, his plans 454, 455, 456, a **Maratha** prisoner 456, also called **Hussain Dost Khan** 467. his son 468, his victory along with **Muzaffar Jang** 468-9, his march upon **Tanjore** 469, his retreat 470, promised **Trichinopoly** 471&N, his troops 473, 474, his ravages 475, 485, **French** help to 493, (**Chanda Sahib**) 502, 510, 511.

Chandragiri 48, 87N, **Mission house** at 90N, 123N, change of capital 153N, 166, 175, 449N.

Chandranagore, 320N, 489N1.

Chandra Sen Jadhav, **Shahu's** enemy 442N.

Chandry or **Chindy**, **Maratha** name of **Gingee** 23.

Chandrayandrug, the southern fortification of **Gingee** 3, 12, 14, 15, **Senda Rayan** fort 85N, temple built by **Muthialu Nayakkan** 88N, 296, 330, 333, attacked 335, 438, 478, 479N. 520.

Chennayya, deprived of his fief 155, appointed commissioner by **Bijapur** 156.

Charles II, **King of England**, his grant to the **East India Co.** 281N1.

Chauth 265, 457.

Chekku, *killa* of 449N.

Chenam Nayak of **Gingee**, 83&N.

Chengama Pass, 336, **Nasir Jang's** arrival at 470, 530&N.

Chengam Fort, 323.

Chenna, cousin of **Yachama Nayak** 106N, 141, general of the loyalists 142.

Chennapattana 153N, 155, taken by Kantirava Narasa 157, viceroyalty of 167, 258N2.

Chennappattanam, see Madras.

Chennasagaram, tank built by the Kalahasti chief 94, 107.

Chera, The. 62N, 73.

Chetput (Settupattu), edifices built by Ramachandra Nayak of Gingee 88N, plunder of 262, Maratha camp at 262, Sadatullah Khan's arrival at 410N, 425, 449N, 457, killedar of 470, 481N1, 489N1, 494, 502, capture of 521, Chitapet 530N.

Chettikulam 8, 11, 25N, see also Rama Setti 433, 434, 438.

Chidambaram 79&N, Pimenta's arrival at 96, 100, 103N, 120, temple dispute 120, 121, under Vijayanagar rule 122, 123&N, 126&N, Venkata's gifts to Saiva mendicants at 126N, 146, 204, 207, near 316, seizure of 348, Daud Khan at 371N, 449N, French ravages near 475, 511, capture of 521, 530N.

Chikkadevaraja 130.

Chikkaraya *alias* Sriranga, chosen as successor by Venkata I 98N.

Child, Sir John 230N, General of India 325N2.

Chimnaji Appa, the Peishwa's brother 455, his death 457.
China, 70N.

Chingleput 34N, Raja of 63, district 129, 134N, 149, conquest of 178, 181N, under the Mughals 261, 449N, 469, 481.

Chinna Bomma Nayaka of Vellore 103, 126N, 131N.

Chinnana, See Mallaiya.

Chinnia Chetti, builder of Fort St. David 269, 275.

Chinna Oba Raya, younger brother of Jaggaraya 141.

Chintadripet, grant of privileges to the English for minting rupees 458N.

Chiryar, The. 493.

Chitaldrug 166, 358N, first Maratha expedition called after 442N.

Chitnis, Khande Ballal 258N1&2, his date for the fall of Gingee 343.

Chittoor, chief of 73, 74N, 172, District 313N, 449N.

Chokkanatha Nayak of Madura 187, 188.

Chokkānatha. Vijayaranga of Madura 440, his widow 452N.

Cholas, The. of the Vijayalaya line and disruption of the empire 27, 39, conquest of 52, 62N, 72, 73, Tanjore victory over 76, 77, chief referred to 122, 123, state interference in social matters 198.

Cholamandalam, chiefs of 73.

Chola Naik, a poligar and a friend of the English 387, his plunder 388.

Clive, Lord, referred to 489N1, his burning of Dupleix Fathabad 489N1, 493, his destruction of the French monument 500, 501, his movements 502 to 504, his march 513N, 515.

Coart. Sen Joan, Dutch chief 281N1.

Cochin. 70N, 138N.

Coimbatore 40. district 51.

Coimbra 70N.

Coleroon, The. 65, 74, 76, 81, chief of 100, 102, 103N, 358N, 470.

Collett, Governor of Madras 447N.

Cologne, 70N.

Commons. The House of 67N.

Comorin. Cape 67, 358N.

Conans, Governor 371N.

Conjeevaram 25N, 37, Little Conjeevaram 51, conquest of 178, Ruler of 248, 249, 250, 252, 261, Maratha success at 262, and retirement from 262, 289, 293N2, attack of 298, 299, 300, 305, 306 to 308, 310, 311, 320N, 466, 481, 489N1.

Coorg. 39.

Coote, Sir Eyre, his capture of Pondicherry 31N2, 520. his success 521 to 524.

Cope, Captain 468, his help to Muhammad Ali 473, ordered to join Muzaffar Jang 473, joined Muhammad Ali 475, 512.

Coromandel Coast 112, arrival of the Dutch fleet on 117, 236, 325N2, 361N, 469, 489N.

Coronatham 397, granted to the English 402.

Courtney Capt. 388.

Coutinho, Fr. Melchior, of Vellore 98N, referred to 105, quoted 106, 107, 130.

Coven Naig, Subhedar, 522.

Coventry Capt. 374, 391&N, his death 392, 395.

Cuddalore 27, 34N, 108, Old Town 165, 192, 237, 240, factory granted to the English 241, 242, 243, 249, 250, 251, 271, called Estambed 272N, 278, 281N1, 294, 314, 315, 325N2, assault on 337N, 347, 348 to 350, mint 355, 357, 370, 372, 374&N, 379, 380, 386, 387, 397, 400, 432, the English at 476, English occupation of 521, English army 524.

Cuddapah District 183, ruler of Cuddapah and Kurnool submitted to Shivaji 213, 248, 289, 291, 293N2, faujdar of 294, 300, 302, 310, 311, 320N, Sambhaji's march to 328, formation of the Nawabship of 358N, Nawab of and his discontent, 471N, 497, 498N, Nawab of 505, 510, 511, 512.

Cumbum 358N, 511.

Dakhin Roy also Dakkana Roy, Dewan of Sadatullah Khan 365N, 366, 367, 443.

Dalavai Agraharam Plates. referred to 129.

Dalpat Rao. 293N2, general of Zulfikar Khan 301, in charge of Kam Baksh's camp 302, 305, his bravery 306&N, 308, 309, his victory 316, 322, 323, 333, 334, agent 343.

Dakkanatha, a sanyasi—and his murder 451-2.

Damalcheruvu Pass, 214, 456.

Damarla Aiyappa, 167, 172.

Damarla, Chenna of Kalahasti and the dalavai of Venkata I, sent to Vellore 131N, his victory over Lingama Nayaka 131N.

Damarla Vengala Bhupala, author of *Bahulāsvacharitam*, referred to 134N.

Damarla Venkatadri or Venkatappa of the Dutch Records and chief of Pulicat 157, his help to Venkatapati 157-8, his grant of Madras to the English 158, his opposition to Venkatapati II's successor 158, his imprisonment by Sriranga III 158, 161, superseded by Mallayya 162, 164, 172.

Danaji Jadhav. his appointment as *senapati* 325N1, 328, 329, his quarrel with Sambhaji 329&N.

Danes, The. 361N.

Dēra Gunta (tent-pit) 319.

Dharwar. 445N.

Daud Khan Panni, Nawab: his plan to change the headquarters from Gingee to Arcot 21, 323, 330, 331, 332, 333, 335, appointed faujdar of the Carnatic 338, his brother 348, appointed to the Carnatic 349, his exhortation 349, 352, 356, 357, his capital 358, appointed Deputy Subhedar of the Deccan 360, his life 360&N,

death 360&N, 361, his capital 361N, his attitude towards the English 361N, visited Madras 361N, his grants to the English 361N, 365, his retirement 367, his amaldars 371N, his attitude towards the English 372, mentioned 410N, referred to 438N, his grant to the English 447N.

Daulat Khan, sent against Dasing 410N, his death 428.

D'Auteuil, French commander 471N, his hasty retreat 471N, Dupleix's order to 476&N, his help to Bussy 478, at Gingee 478, his account of the capture of Gingee 479N, 481N1.

Devagadh, *killa* of 449N.

Devula Papa. defeat of 106N.

Deccan, Mughal advance in 175, 176, 181, Mughal victory 211, western 257, Mughal operations in 331, 332, deputy Subhedar of 360, Mughal government 366, 440, *chauth* with held from 441, 443, politics of 462, subhedar of 471N, 509, 513N.

Delhi, Emperor of 15, 251, 301, 369, 420, a letter referred to 430, 443, 447N, his conferment of distinction referred to 450N, 467, 481N1.

Dasing, Raja of Gingee 8, 9, his bathing platform 9, his tutelary God 12, his fight with Sadatullah Khan referred to 12, 351 to 353, his ballad and his father 369, his achievement at Delhi 369, 382N, son of Sarup Singh : his rule 410&N, his arrival at Bednore 410N, promised to help the Raja 410N, attacked the Marathas and got a lakh of rupees and a horse 410N, his arrival at Gingee 410N, assumption of power, and attacked by the Nawab's forces 410N, his fight and death 410N. his wife committed *sati* 410N, his gallantry 417, also Jaya Singh or Tej Singh or Tajab Singh or Taggy Singh 417N1

418, ballad's account of him 419, 420, his help to Bednur recalled 421, at Gingee 422, causes for the struggle with Sadatullah Khan 423, 424, 425, his indignation towards the Nawab's officials 425, joined by the killedar of Valudavur 426, his army 426 his determination to fight 427, the fight 428, shot at 428, date of the battle 429, 430, his wife committed *sati* 423, his cremation at Gingee 433, Nawab's regard for him 433; an estimate of his rule 435.

Dēsūr 306, fort 307, battle of 308, Maratha victory at 320N, 352, 437N1, 489N1, 494, 507, 508, 512.

Devagiri, The Yadavas of 199.

Devanāmpatnam, see also Tegnapatam :—Raja Ram to sell it 267, 268, 272N1, 279, 280, 281N1, 285, 349, 370.

Devanur, 27, 31, 207, 426.

Devaraja II, 54.

Devas, The 7.

Dhabade, Khande Rao, the conqueror of Gujarat 253, 254.

Dhanaji Jadhav, 253, 254, his success at Phaltan 255, 257, his help to Raja Ram 297, 298, his success 300, 301, 308, 315, in the south 324, 325.

Dharmaraja temple at Gingee 88N.

Dindigul 452N, 456.

Divakara Nayaka, brother of Surappa Nayaka 90.

Divi Varu, Brahman householders 318.

Divukottah (or Devikotta) at the mouth of the Coleroon 76, the ruler of 102.

Doddācharya, or Mahācharya of Sholinghur 79N, 123N, 126N, reconsecrated the Govindaraja shrine at Chidambaram 126N.

Dorasamudra 43.

Dowson, John and H. M. Elliot, quoted 338.

Draupadi Amman temple at Gingee 88N.

Duarte, Adrian, his account 234N.

Dubino, Fr. Antony 98N.

Dubreuil, Prof. Jouveau, referred to 489N1, 494N, 500, 509, 513.

Dupleix, his statue 7, and 520N, on the treatment of prisoners of war 20N, his *dubash* 465, 468, 469, his plans 471N, his orders to Bussy 476, his scheme for the capture of Gingee 476&N, 477, 499N, his appreciation of Bussy's capture of Gingee 469N, his terms to Nasir Jang 485, 439, Dupleix Fathabad 489N1.

Dutch, The. Their relation with Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee 107, arrival in India 108, alliance with the Zamorin 108, their penetration into the Bay of Bengal 108, permission to build a fort on the Coromandel Coast 108, construction of the fort at Tegnapatam 109&N, 110, Venkata opposed to them 110, asked to deliver the fort to the Portuguese 111, disappointment 112, secured a *cowle* from the Nayak of Gingee for their factory at Tegnapatam and allowed to lodge in the castle of Tiruppapuliyur 114, allowed to trade with neighbouring towns, 115, friendly attitude towards the king of Kandy 116, help sought by Tanjore and Jaffnapatam 117, their request to Tanjore for founding a factory 117, conclusion of the trade contract with Aya 118, got permission of the Raya to trade with Pulicat 119, 147N, their trade and internal relations 162-3, joined Sriranga III 163, 164, Sriranga's request for help 179, peace with Golkonda 180, their arrival at

Gingee 192, at Pulicat 207, fear of 208.
attempt to capture Pondicherry 275, 276,
their hold on Manjakkuppam 279, their
attitude towards the English 280, 281&N1,
attempt to retake Manjakuppam 285, their
- help to the Mughals 290, capture of Pondi-
cherry 320N, 361N, 371N.

E

East India Company, The English, 270, 272N1, 281N1, &
528.

East India Company, The French 210, 218N7.

Edwardes, Mr. S. M., referred to 83, his chronology of the
Gingee Nayaks from a ms. 83, description
of the ms. and discrepancies therein 83N.

Egmore, grant of 325N2, 349, scare at 361N, 447N.

Elangādu forest 88N, 485.

Elavānāsūr 449N.

Elliot, Sir H. M. quoted 338.

Ellore, the faujdar of 462.

Elwick, Governor of Madras 447N.

Empson, Mr. sent with presents to the Nawab 346.

England, 67N, 209, despatches from 244, Gregorian
Calendar accepted in 346N, despatches to
354, letter to 369, 370, 372, 380, 384, 397,
despatches to 404, 405, 407, 417N1, 418, 419,
423N, 430N3, 431N3, 434, 435N.

Krishnagiri is known as the English-Mountain 3,
11, capture of Gingee from the French
referred to 20, treatment of prisoners of
war 20N, got Madras 158, 161, renewed
their grant for it from Mir Jumla 164,
settlement at Fort St. George 207, attempt
to found a factory in Gingee 207-9, and the
Marathas 220-1, 230N, 240, their negotiations

240-1, their failure 241, their appeal to Surat 242, got privileges from Sambhaji 242, fortification of their factories 248, 251, their factory at Porto Novo closed 263, an account of their purchase of Fort St. David 267-9, 270, 271, their help to the Mughals 272N1, negotiations for acquiring settlements in Gingee 274-85, attempt to found a factory at Cuddalore 276-7, 279, its limits—Gundugramam 279, 280, took possession of Manjakkuppam 285, help sought by the Marathas 287, and by the Mughals 289, 290, their presents to Kam Baksh 293, attempt to conciliate the Mughals 349, their demand for Cuddalore and Tegnapatam 349-50, right to coinage 355, Daud Khan's attitude towards them 361N, their presents to Daud Khan 361N, relations with Sarup Singh 368-374, 378-9, purchase of Fort St. David referred to 370, their help to Zulfikar Khan 374, their fighting at Fort St. David 374, growth of their acquisitions 374N, 377, causes for their war with Sarup Singh 381, bad treatment of the English captives at Gingee 382, 383, attempt to secure the release of their prisoners by paying ransom 383, attempt to secure peace 392, their letter of complaint against Sarup Singh to Zulfikar Khan 394&N, consideration of Sarup Singh's peace terms 397-8, agreement to pay ransom 400, outbreak of troubles 400, peace 401, terms of peace 402, release of English prisoners 402, causes for their treaty 404, 305&N, 407, quarrel with Sarup Singh referred to 426, their letter of congratulation to the Nawab 431, and subsequent present of money 432, their embassy to the Nawab 447N, records 458N, their attempts to secure

privileges from the Nizam 461, their troops joined Muhammad Ali 473, their capture of Gingee 520 and 524-9.

Ekōji (Vyankaji) Bhonsle at Tanjore 226, 227, his help to Raja Ram 287, his submission to Zulfikar Khan 351.

Enṇāyiram, Inscription at 200.

Ennore, 361N.

Ensign Ray, capture of 373.

Ernavore, granted to the English 458N.

Europe 67N, European nations prohibited from trading with the natives 118, their settlements on the coast 207, European factories 288, European soldiers tempted by the Mughals 289, settlements on the coast 361N, 374N.

Evora, 70N.

Eyil, 50.

F

Fakruddin Mubarak Shah, Sultan of Madura 57.

Farmer, Mr. 380, 390, 396, 397.

Farrūkh Siyār, Emperor 360, his succession 361, 367, 368, his order for the recovery of dues 410N, invited Terani Singh to tame his horse 419, 423, his grant to the English 447N.

Fasli year, an account of 33N1.

Fateh Darwaja, gate of Gingee 336.

Fatehpur, place where Desing fell 433, 437, 513N.

Fateh Singh Bhonsle, sent to the south by Shahu, 440, 441, his second expedition into the south also a failure 442, granted the jaghir of Akalkot 442N, 455, 456, 457.

Fauchaux, M. referred to 489N1.

Ferrolì, D. referred to 70N.

Figueroa, Suarez De, mentioned 109N.

Floyer, Governor, Nasir Jang's request for help to 473, 475.

Fontaine, Abraham 118.

Forrest Sir G. 489N1.

Fort, St. David 108, 167, bought by the English 270, named after the Welsh Saint 272, starting of mint at 272, 279, 385, fortification 386&N, 387, 389, taken possession of 390, fight with Gingee 391, 392, 393, 394N1, projects of peace 395, peace terms submitted to the Council of Fort St. George 395, 397, 398, 400, quarrel with Sarup Singh 419.

Fort, St. George, grant of 158, Governors of 179, foundation of 207, 208, 209, records of 217, 218, the English and Shivaji 220, 221, 222, 238, 243, genesis of the first settlement of 325N2, Letters of 333, 336, 337, 338, 344, 347, 349, 350, 352, 355, 357, 369, 370, 372, 378, 380, Council considered unreasonable the demand of Sarup Singh 398, 399, 404, 406.

Fraser, Mr. William, Chief of Fort, St. David 371, his agreement Louis (Pondicherry) 371&N, 407. 523.

Freeman, Robert, the English envoy at Gingee 241, 242, his proposal to settle an English factory 277.

Freire, Fr. Andre, referred to 16, 186, 223, 225.

French, The, their occupation of the Gingee fort and the erection of batteries 6, their removal of the monolithic columns from Gingee and their erection of Dupleix's statue at Pondicherry 7, fortification of Gingee 18, 520f1N, their batteries 18, their Royal Battery 19, attempts to found a factory on the coast 210, help of Sher Khan 233, got privileges from Harji Raja 251, agent received at

Gingee 262, Zulfikar Khan's order to 294, their friendly attitude towards the Marathas 294, at Pondicherry 431, their attempts to secure privileges from the Nizam 461, their war with the English 466, their victory over Muhammad Ali 473, factions among the officers of 471N, and Chanda Sahib; their withdrawal from Chidambaram 475, their expedition against Nasir Jang 476, capture of Gingee 478-9, and account of their capture 479N, 481&N1, 482, attack on Nasir Jang's camp 405, *et seq.* their alliance with Haidar 530, 531.

G

- Gadag, battle of 213, tribute exacted from 441.
- Gadilam, The, 34N, 104, 115N, 471N.
- Galgala, Imperial court at 311.
- Galland M., 479N.
- Gandaraguli Maraiya Nayak 49.
- Gandikota, siege of 106N,
- Gangadevi, wife of Kamparaya 48, 58.
- Gangamma Nayak 83&N.
- Ganges, The, 193
- Garrow Mr.: 531.
- Garstin Mr., referred to 9, 15, 24, 391N.
- Gary, Henry 222, 242,, his mission to Sambhaji 242.
- Gazanfar Khan 337, appointed killedar of Gingee 347, 348.
- Ghazanfar Ali Khan 487N1, 506, 508.
- Geldria, fort at Pulicat 119, proposed abolition of 119.
- Germain, Mon. St. 251.
- Ghatge, Sarji Rao, chief of Panhala, defeated by the Mughals: sought service under them 256.
- Ghaziud-din Khan, killedar of Gingee 464.

Ghaziu'd-din Khan, brother of Nasir Jang, 467.

Ghorepade, Baji, father of Maloji 212.

Ghorepade. Maloji Raji, 212.

Ghorepade, Murari Rao 058N, power established in Gooty 442N, turned out of the south 460.

Ghorepade, Santaji, sent to the south 245, 246, 253, 254, his attack on Aurangzib 255, 257, general of Raja Ram 265, 266, his help to Raja Ram 297, his attack on Kanchi 298, 300, 301, his arrival at Gingee 305, 306, 307, attacked Kasim Khan 310, 320N, in the south 324, 325, his quarrel with Danaji 325N1, his defeat 328, his retirement to Maharashtra 329&N, 340.

Ghulam Ali, (Gulam Ali) brother of Sadatullah Khan, 364, made jaghirdar of Vellore 365&N, 429, made *mansabdar* of a thousand horse 438N, his son as the Nawab 438N, 450.

Ghulam Hussain, Mir, killedar of Gingee 464.

Giddangal 449N.

Gingee, a description of the fort 1 to 16, its citadels 2, animal sacrifice at 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, its topography 14, 15, called the Troy of the East 15, its fortifications 15, 15, 16&N, its conservation 18 to 21, its insanitation 20, 21, change of the Carnatic headquarters from 21, proposed depot for salt storage 21, origin of the name 21 to 23, its old name Krishnapura 23, also called Badshabad, Chandry and Nasrat Gaddah 23, spelt Gingee by the English and Jinji by the French, and as Chingee or Chengy in the early Madras records 23, identified with Singavaram by Garstin 24, derivation of the word 24N1&2, its beginnings 27, 28, fortified *circa* 1200 A.D. 31, its relations with Ananda Kon 31, the Kon

dynasty 33N, under the Kurumbas 34&N, under Vijayanagar 35, 41 under Vallappa or Vallabharaya 44, under the Hoysalas 42 to 47, passed on to Vijayanagar Nayaks 65, 66, sources for their history 66, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73 to 76, their emigration to Vijayanagara 78, and then to Gingee 71, their relationship with Surappa Nayaka 78, foundation of the Nayakship of 78, Kurumba chiefs of, defeated by Vijayanagar 79, date of the commencement of the Nayak rule 80, Tubaki Krishnappa was the founder of this line 81, 82, Date of the beginning of Gingee Nayaks 1464 A.D. 82, Nayaks according to Mackenzie Mss. 82, according to Edwardes 83&N, its capture 83N, fort, granaries and fortifications built by Tubaki Krishnappa 85, 87&N, the Right and Left Hand Caste inhabitants of 88N, 89, 90 to 95&N, heyday of its glory 96, description of the city by Pimenta 96-101, Pimenta's new city identified with Krishnapatam 100, 101, Nayaks of 101 to 103, Venkata's proposed war upon 104, abandonment of the invasion 105, Venkata's envoy to 110, 111, 113; Gingee coast, Dutch beginnings in 112, 113, 114, levy of tolls 115, 116, 118, 119, Nayak of 123, the Nayak and the great civil war 131&N, 134N, the Gingee Nayak, and his disloyalty 142, 143, 145 to 147, Yacha's victory over 149, later Nayaks 150, Muhammadans at 150, 151&N, 152, the Nayak going to Tirumala 159, his rebellion against Sriranga III 162, attack on 165, Bijapur occupation of 165, Mussalman penetration into 166, campaign against it referred to 169, the Nayak and Shahji 169 to 172, campaign against 173, surrendered in 1649 A.D. 174, 175, its final sack 180&N, an

account of its seige 183, its surrender (1648 A.D.) 184, 185, attempts at the restoration of the Nayak dynasty 187, 188, Shahji's part in its capture 187, under Bijapur 188, its tribute 190, Nayak of 191, an account of its court 192-6, its buildings 105-7, its monuments 201, Muhammadan invasion against 205, under Bijapur and Maratha rule 206-86, its first *killedar* 206, known as Badshahbad 207, Bijapuri organization of 207, Shivaji's advance towards 214, and capture of 215, 217, an account of its capture 215N, Shivaji's march upon 220, 222, 223, Shivaji's conquest of 223, his fortifications 223-4, its importance to Shivaji 225 to 228, Maratha viceroy of 229; 230N, 232, its governor defeated by Sher Khan of Valikandapuram 233, organisation of 236, 237, under Sambhaji 238, Harji Raja's rule 239, English attempts to found a factory on the coast 240-1, 242 to 247, Kasim Khan's march upon 247, Harji Raja's establishment of authority over 248, 249 to 253, 256, Raja Ram at 257, 259&N2, Mughal forces despatched to 259, 260, Harji and Kesha Trimbak at 262, Anarchy around 263, 264, *subhedar* of 266, Marathas at 267, 272N1, English attempts to acquire land on the coast 274-85, 281N4, Mughal capture of 286-308, Zulfikar Khan at 286, Maratha retreat 287, pillaged 288, Mughal siege of 295-6, account of the siege 296-30, 313N, Mughal siege for many years and fall of 335, 337&N, named Narsat Gadh 338, account of its surrender 338-42, date of its fall 342-50, loss of its importance 348, under the Mughals 351, granted to Sarup Singh 354, 356 to 358N, 361N, 369, 370, 373, 374&N, 380 to 385, 387, 390, condition of the

people 391, 393, 394N, 395, 398, 399, forces of 400, 402, stipulations of the treaty 402-405N, Desing's arrival at 410N, Nawab's entry into 410N, 418, account of the country in the ballad 419, 421 to 423N, killedari of 424, attack on 425, Nawab's capture of 429, battle of 429 to 432, reminiscences of Desing's rule 433 to 435&4, end of Rajput rule 436, loss of importance 437, was abandoned by the Nawab 438, strife in 440, Mughal prince at 446, 847, *killas* of 449N, 454, killedar of 464, 465, 468, 469, Nazir Jang's occupation of 470, 571N, 473, Dupleix's order to capture 471N, Muhammad Ali's flight to 476, French capture of 476&N, 477&N, French occupied Gingee 478-9, 479N; English capture of 520, et seq.

Goa 70N, arrival of the Dutch fleet 112, viceroy of 142, 218N, siege of 253.

Gobburi chiefs, 135N.

Golkonda, Gingee Nayak's association with 82N, 153N, its attitude 154, invasion beaten off by Sriranga III 159, defeat of the forces of 161, attack on Pulicat 162, 163, forces routed by Sriranga, 163, 164, attack on Sriranga 164, 167, 169, in the siege of Vellore 171, 172, Sultan of 174, his suspicion of Mir Jumla 176, arrest of Mir Jumla's son 176, his support to Sriranga 177, forces attacked by Krishnappa 179, 180, army's attempt to escape from the south 111, its supremacy over the Carnatic 181N, 183, 185, forces 206, Sultan 209, help to Shivaji 211 to 213, 215N, 217, 220, 227 to 229, 230&N, 232, help sought by Nasir Khan 233, 234&N, its deputy 240, governors of 244, siege of 245, 246,

capture of 247, 248, territories of 249, fall of 259, 261 to 263, Raja Ram's attempt to take it 264, conquest of 325N2, 361N.

Gooty (Gutti) fort capture of 106N, 358N, the Ghorepades of 442N, 456.

Gopal Dadaji, Pandit, Subhedar of Porto Novo and his help to the English 241, 243.

Gopala Pillai, temple of 85N.

Gopalaswami, temple of 32.

Gopalakrishna Pillai of Gingee 83N.

Gopanarya, Brahman general of Kampana 25, 47, 48, 50, 59, 61, his reconsecration of the God of Srirangam 61, 62&N, 71, 79.

Gopinatha, feudatory of the Hoysalas 44.

Goradkar, Vithal Pildev, appointed subhedar of Gingee 216.

Gover, Charles E., referred to 417.

Govinda Dikshita, the Tanjore minister 75N, his son 77, 143.

Govinda Kon, 31N, 32, 33N1.

Govindaraja shrine at Chidambaram 79, its restoration 79, its destruction under a Chola 79N, the idol at Tirupati and removed later to Chidambaram 79N, repairs done 96, 120, 121, 123&N, founded by a Pallava ruler 123N, destruction of and date of its re-consecration 123N, 126&N.

Govindarasar. a general of Kampana 50.

Grand Anicut the 135N.

Grant Duff, J. 191N, 214N, 226, 452N.

Gregory. Pope, his reform of the Calendar 345N.

Greenhill, Mr., English Agent 162, 178.

Guerreiro, 70N.

Gujarat, 253.

Gundalakama river, The, 358N,

Gundu Gramam 279.

Guntur, 181N, circar 358N.

Gurramkonda, fight near 288N, 289, Mughal pursuit as far as 337N, 358N.

Guzaffar Khan 350, 352, 354, 355.

Guzman 70N.

Gyfford, William, Governor of Madras 238, 246, Chief of Vizagapatam 278.

H

Haidar Ali. his vandalism 202.

Hajjaj bin Yusuf, his tyranny in Arabia 364.

Hakim Ismail *alias* Manoel de Olevera, the agent of Gingee 208.

Hambir Rao Mohite, Shivaji's commander 213, his advance and fight 213, 236.

Hampaya Wodeyar, *alias* Ballala IV 42.

Hampi, ruins of 16N.

Hanumaji Pantulu 374N, 434.

Hanumante, Ragunath Narayan, his agreement with Gingee 226, and the originator of the Karnatak expedition 226, an account of him 226, his treaty with Golkonda 227, 234N, 236, dismissed by Sambhaji 237 an account of his imprisonment 238&N.

Hanumante, Janardan, Raja Ram's minister 265.

Harihara, the founder of Vijayanagar dynsty 44.

Harihara II, 52 to 56, his date 56N, his titles 62N, 71, 72, called Kumara Virupanna Udyar 71.

Harji, Hindoo Rao, 329N.

Harji, Mahādik, Sambhaji's brother-in-law, appointed to Gingee and the Maratha viceroy of the south 229, an account of him 238&N, 239,

241, his exactions from the English 241, 243, orders to depose him 245, 246, his authority in Gingee 247, 248, established his power in Gingee 248, his quarrels with Keshava Pant 249, attempt to reconquer the territories of Golkonda 249, his behaviour 250, grant of privileges to the French 251, 252, made himself independent in the south and later death 252, his lieutenant 257, sent an army to help Raja Ram 258, his son as viceroy 258N2, date of his death 258N2, at Gingee 260, his interference in the affairs of Trichinopoly as against Mysore 260, 261, 262, his army to invest Golkonda 262, received a French agent 262, 263, his imprisonment of Trimbak 263, his idea of submitting to the Mughals 263, his death 263, 278.

Harpanahalli, Nayak of 171, 358N.

Harrison, Edward, Governor of Madras 325N2, 381, his attempt to secure peace 394, 395, his strictures on the English conduct 396, 397 447N.

Harze, de 119.

Hastings, Marquis of, purchased the Mackenzie Collection 67N.

Hassan Ali, his seizure of Gingee 419.

Hatsell. Mr., Governor of Fort St. David 271, 279, 280, 324, 348.

Haughton, Mr., his escape 380.

Haye, Baron de La, 218N, 227, 232, 234N.

Haynes, Mr., 281N1, 315.

Hebert, Mon., French Governor, his mediation 374, his support sought by the English 390, his mediation 401, 403, his reward 404.

Hemaji Pandit, his Mysore expedition 157.

- Heras, Fr. H., referred to 98N, 107, 109N, 142, 196.
Higginson, Nathaniel, President of Fort St. George 299,
325N2, 350.
Himmat Khan, Nawab of Kurnool 460.
Himmat, Tiyar Khan, killed 460.
Hindustan 332, 419.
Hirasat Khan, of Satgadh, 459.
Houtman, Cornelius, commander of the first Dutch fleet
108.
Hoysalas, The, 27, 34N, 42, their records 43N, their
kingdom 44, their decline 45. 47&N3, 77.
Hugonin, James, capture of 373, 380, 386&N.
Hussain Khan, Mayana, a Bijapur captain: his defeat
213.
Husain Khan, Tahir, accompanied Anwaru-d-din to
Arcot 468.
Hyacinthe, Abraham, original name of Anquetil du
Perron 92N.
Hyderabad 212, Shivaji's arrival at 212, Nizam's capital
442N, Nizam's stay at 443, 460, 461, 463,
467, 468.

I

- Ibn Battuta, the Moorish traveller 46.
Ikkeri, the Nayaks of 126N, their conversion of Jainas
to Saivism 126N, inimical attitude towards
Mysore 155, Nayak captured by Mussal-
mans 156, 157, 160, attacked 167, his
restoration 168, 171, help to Sriranga 172,
175.
Ilaivāṇiyans, The, 198.
Imam Sahib, a friend of Dost Ali Khan 460.
Indian sepoys, East, 477.
Islamic influence on architecture 11.

Ismail Khan, Makha, 258N2.

Iswaran Kōil, conservation of 20.

Itikād Khan, the Mughal general 285.

Iwaz Khan, sent to the Carnatic by Asaf Jah 440, his exploits in the Carnatic 440.

J

Jadhes, (Jedhes) The, Deshmukhs of Kari 223.

Jaffnapatam, king, sought the help of the Dutch 117, Vellalas of 137.

Jaggadeva Rayal, governor of Chennapatana, 155, 156.

Jaggadeva of Kaveripatam, 169, fight against 171.

Jaggaraya, the Gobburī chief and brother-in-law of Venkata I 106N, his part in the civil war of Vijayanagar 131, his success 133, his murder of Sri Ranga Raya 134&N, his flight to the South 135&N, his attempt in favour of his sister 135N, 138, 139, his capture of power 138-39, 140, his younger brother Obaraja 141, his defeat 141 to 144&N1, his death 145, 146, his brother 147 to 149.

Jainas, The. 7, their persecution in Gingee 80, their temple 88N, their conversion to Saivism 126N, 203.

Jaipur, Raja of 353.

Jambai, Inscription 89.

Jamdatu'l Mulk, Zulfikar Khan in charge of the siege of Gingee, his opposition to Kam Bhaksh 340, 341.

James, King of England, his grant to the English East India Company 281N1.

Jammanna Udayar, son of Kampana 49.

Janoji Nimbalkar, 510.

Janjira, attack on 455.

Jannambika, sister of Harihara II 53 to 55.

Jannambikābdhi *alias* Alampundi or Jannāmbikasamudram 53.

Jarric, Pierre du 69, his life 70N, his work and translation 70N, 122N.

Jats The. troubles from 367.

Javādi Hills 32N3.

Jayankōndan 27, 31, 88N.

Jayankondacholamandalam, 27.

Jedhe Sakhāvali, the 222, an account of 223N.

Jesuits, The. 96, their influence in the Vijayanagar court 98N, Jesuit Missions 75, 95N, 130.

Jesus, Society of 70N, 95N, 98N, 109N.

Johnstone, Sir Alexander, founder of the Royal Asiatic Society 67N, son-in-law of Lord Napier 67N.

Julian Calendar, The. 345N.

Juppalli Varu, 318.

K

Kaepelin 215N, 257.

Kadalimalai, Nawab's arrival at 410N, Desing shot at 428.

Kādarayas, The. 34N, 43.

Kaikkōlas, The. 198, 199.

Kailas-ghad, 365N, 449N.

Kairiyat Khan, 183.

Kākar Khan, 296, 297, made killedar of Gingee 337, 350, his death 350, 355.

Kakatiyas, The. 27, 34N.

Kalahasti, chief of 73, 93, 131N, 134N, 157, 220, Nayak of and his help to the Carnatic Nawab 410N.

Kalahastiswara shrine at Adaippalam, 126N.

Kalakavi, Chengalva author 75N.

Kalakor, 333, 334.

Kalasha, Sambhaji's favourite 245.

Kalavai, 51, Kalavaighad 449N.

Kallakkurichi, 426. Kalolghadh (?) 497.

Kalyāṇakōti Vimana of the Varadaraja temple, erected by
Tatacharya 128, 129.

Kalyāṇamahāl, description of 10, 18, 85, called the
Queen's residence 85N, 201, 410N, Nawab's
darbar at 432, 446.

Kalyānpur, 421N.

Kamakshi, mother of Bukka, 52, queen of Sangama 54.

Kamalagiri, another name for Rajagiri, 2, 3, Goddess of
23, fortress built by Ananda Kon and re-
named Anandagiri 31.

Kamalakkanni Amman, Virgin goddess of Gingee 5, her
temple 5, identified with Senjiamman 5, also
called sister of Senjiamman, and her temple
22, 85N.

Kam Baksh, son of Aurangzib sent to the Carnatic 292,
293&N2, 294, his correspondence with Raja
Ram 300, his proposed alliance with the
Marathas 301, under watch 301-2, his
foolishness 302, 303, as prisoner 303, 304,
312, 313, arrest of 320N, 325N2, 341, and
release 341&N.

Kammālas, The. 197, 199.

Kampana Udayār, also called Kampana II, 48, his south-
ern conquests 48 to 50, gift to Srirangam
temple 51, his inscription 51.

Kanara, South 358.

Kanchi, 42, 49, 58, Vaishnava temples at 128, Kanchi-
puram 197, 198.

Kande Rao, killedar 335.

Kandy, King of 116.

- Kangayam, 51.
- Kaṇṇanūr, 43, 45, 47, identified with Kabban of Ibubattuta 46, 47, also Kandur 55.
- Kanthirava Narasa of Mysore 157, captured Chennapatna 157, hostility with Madura 157, gave asylum to Sriranga III 160, his submission to Shahji 168, his death 180.
- Karikāl, surrender of 52.
- Karna, illegitimate son of Raja Ram. sent to the Nawab 329, 330.
- Karnataka country, The. Lower 42, 62N.
- Karnataka, Rājākkal Savisthara Charitam*: an account of its compilation and contents as studied by W. Taylor 28N, French translation of part of the work by M. Gnanou Diagou, 28N, its bearing on Gingee history 68.
- Karnātakghad, 449N.
- Karvetinagar chief of 138.
- Karunguzhi, 449N, 450.
- Kasbur Khan, see Guzaffar Khan.
- Kasidas Bukkansi, business house of 368N.
- Kasim Khan, faujdar 247, his march upon Gingee 247, 248,
- „ governor of Sira and his defeat 325N1, Nawab designate of the Carnatic 325N2.
- Kasturi Rangappa, Yachama's father 148.
- Kathiwakam, 361N, granted to the English 447N.
- Kāttumannārgudi, 316.
- Kaveri, The, 74, 135N, 143, cutting open the dam of 143, 144, erection of a pillar of victory 145, the countries to the north of it taken by the Bijapurians 156.
- Kāvēripākkam, plunder of 262, Kaveripak 310, 502, 503, 530.

Kāveripatam, Nayak of 168 to 170, 175.

Katteri, 489, 491.

Keigwin, got grants from Sambhaji 242.

Kempe Gowda of Bangalore, his submission 168.

Kenge Hanuma, his defeat by the Ikkeri Nayak and his seeking the aid of Bijapur 155, reinstated 156, 168.

Kesava Pingle, sent by Sambhaji to the south 245, 246, *alias* Kesava Pant 246, his obedience to Harji and attack on Mysore 247, recalled 248, his return to Gingee 249 to 251, his imprisonment and release 252, sent to the Carnatic 260, arrived at Gingee 261, 262, his plunder 262, imprisoned and released 263. became governor of Gingee 264.

Kesava Raman, appointed *subhedar* of Kanchi 299.

Khafi Khan, his tour 338.

Khan Bahadur, adopted son of Sadatullah Khan 365, 438N, 449.

Khan Sahib of Kallakkurichi; joined the Nawab against Desing 426.

Khan-i-Khanan, Khawas Khan, his expedition 170, 183, 214N, his son 215N, leader of the Deccani nobles at Bijapur 215N, arrested 215N, his death mentioned 218N, his assassination by Bahlol Khan 233.

Khizr Khan, Panni, father of Daud Khan, 360.

Kinneer, Major 517, 518.

Kincaid, Mr. referred to 247.

Kishore Singh Hada, Raja, officer of Zulfikar Khan and his death 328.

Koduttalam, battle of 456.

Kōbilingan, the chief of the Kurumba tribe 31N, 34, 37, 41, defeat of 79.

Kolar, district 43, 166, 169, 336, Maratha outpost at 442N,
Muzaffar Jang's march to 468.

Koliyanur, 470.

Kollapalayam, 88N.

Kōn dynasty, The. Ananda Kon the founder 31&N, an
account of it 31N, 34N, 42, 83N, 85N, 88N.

Koneri Chetti, the *generalissimo* of Sriranga III 177,
his betroyal 177, 178, imprisoned by the
Muhammadans 178.

Koneri Kon, (Goneri Kon) of the Kon dynasty 31N, 32.

Kongu, chiefs, The 39, Kongu country 44, Kantirava's
march upon 157.

Konkan, the, 364, 365, 438N.

Koppal, Maratha outpost 442N.

Kōpperunjinga Kādavaraya, his connection with Kobi-
lingan and an account of his reign 34N, his
titles 34N, the problem of two Kopperun-
jingas 34N, 35.

Krishna, The. 67, 213, 358N, 469.

Krishnadevaraya, his reduction of the Marutham fort 37,
his times 48, 63, 72, his Carnatic expedition
73, 74, his division of the empire 74&N, and
the Karnataka 80, date of his expedition, *circa*
1509 A.D. 81, 82, 83N, 87, 123N, 126, 129,
his revenue 190.

Krishnadrug, 171.

Krishnagiri, 11, 14, 15, repairs done 18, 19, 32, 85N, 88N,
296, 333, attacked 335, 438, 449N, 478, 479N,
520.

Krishna Kon (Crishna Con), 31N, 32, 33N1.

Krishna Lord. sculpture of 9, tutelary god of the
shepherds rulers of Gingee 23.

Krishnappa Nayaka, Bala, 80, (Vala) 150N.

Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee 23, 66, 69, 73 to 75, men-
tioned in the Tanjore Literature 76, his im-

prisonment 76, under Venkatapathi I 90, 91, identified with Varadappa Nayaka 91, possible identification with Venkatappa Nayaka 91, 92, his accession and imprisonment at Gingee 92, and escape 93, rebelled against Venkata 93, his release and marital alliance with Tanjore 93, his confinement 94, a wise and able ruler 95&N, 96, his hospitality towards the Jesuits 96, his stay at Chidambaram 96, his putting out the eyes of his uncle as mentioned by Fr. Pimenta 98, a description of him 92, his ally and feudatory 100, granting of permission to build a church 101 to 104, his early rebellion against Venkata I 104, his refusal to pay tribute to Vijayanagar 105, his feigned insanity 105, his embassy to Venkata 105, his defeat 105, fell a prisoner 106, his submission to Venkata 107, retired to Singavaram 107 and subsequent return to his capital 107, his relations with the Portuguese and the Dutch 107, permitted the latter to build a fort in his territory 108, grant of *farman* to them 108, his hostility towards the Portuguese 108, Venkata's order to drive away the Dutch and his reluctance to carry out the order 110, ordered the Dutch to deliver the fort of Tegnapatam to the Portuguese 111, Dutch request for a second time 112, and refusal, called a friend of the Portuguese 112, restoration of Tegnapatam to the Dutch 113, his favourable attitude towards the Dutch 115, 118, a staunch Vaishnava and a patron of Vaishnavism 120, 121, his determination to restore the Vaishnava shrine at Chidambaram 121, his relation with the temple Brahmans of the place 121, his order to shoot the recalcitrant Saivites 122, 123, his relig-

ious attitude 126N, 203, his other services 203, his part in the civil war 131&N, his early defeat and imprisonment referred to 131N, his feudatories 131N, his refusal to pay tribute, etc. 131N, war with Venkata 131N, a prisoner for a second time 131N, 143, his flight from the battle 145, second defeat 146, his early rebellion referred to 149, his marital alliance with Tanjore referred to 149, 150, his successors 150, recalled by Sriranga III 162, his victory over the Moors 162, his court 191, his hospitality towards the Jesuits 192, arrival of the Dutch 192, 193, practice of tilting in Gingee 194, royal pomp 195, 197, 200, 201, his building the Kalyana Mahal and other buildings 201-2.

Krishnappa Nayaka Tubakala (or Tubaki) 25, also called Kistnappa Nayaka 25N, accompanied Krishnadeva Raya, 81, second in command 81, founder of the Nayak line of Gingee 81, entry in the Carnatic 82.

Krishnappa Nayaka, Tubaki of the 17th century, 25N, 82N, 86, Mir Jumla's lieutenant and Koneri Chetty overtures to 178, also Topa Krishnappa, 178, 179, attacked by the Golkonda forces 179, his peace with the English 179, besieged Poonamallee 180, his defeat and fall 180.

Krishnappa Nayaka, Dubala, identified with Venkatapati Nayaka 81, and with Tubaki Krishnappa Nayaka 81-2, 83&N, 85, builder of temples and granaries 85&N, also forts 86, his successor 87, 88N, his Rajaguru 88N, performed sacrifice 88N, his gifts 88N.

Krishnappa Nayaka Trimbakmal 83&N.

Krishnapatam, town built by Krishnappa Nayaka of Gingee 100, identified with Agaram village,

west of Porto Novo 100, situated in Arungor according to Du Jarric 100, construction of 100-1, 131N, 203 ; see also Porto Novo.

Krishnapuram, another name of Gingee 23.

Krishna Sastri H. referred to 138&N2.

Krishnaswami Aiyangar, Dr. S. referred to 57, 62N, his account of Raja Ram's escape 336, 352, his account of Desing 410N.

Krishnaswami temple at Gingee 85N.

Kudal or Cuddalore 34N.

Kufa, nobles of 364.

Kulasekhara Alwar 123N.

Kulattur 49.

Kulbarga, Treaty of 234N.

Kuli Beg: Golkonda commander, his victory over Tubaki Krishnappa and further conquests 180.

Kulōttunga Chola I, 123N.

Kulottunga Chola II, 122N, 123N, called Anapaya and Tiruniṟṟu Chola 123N.

Kulottunga Krimikanta, his removal of the image of Govindarajā 79N, identified with Kulottunga II 122&N3, 123N3.

Kulottungan, Senni 123N.

Kulottunga Cholan Ula 123.

Kumara Kampana, 25, Kamparaya 47, his conquests 48, called Kampana Udayar 48, son of Bukka I 55, date of his invasion 57, as Ballala's door-keeper 57, his conquest of Madura and Srirangam 58, and restoration of their temples 58 to 60, 62&N, 71, 79.

Kumara Nayana, son of Yachama Nayak 318.

Kumara Yachasamudram, 313N.

Kumbakonam, 126N, 135N, 143.

Kundapur, 358N.

Kunjagadi, killa of 449N.

Kunimedu, Dutch ships at 112, 236, 240, 242, English settlement at; in 1682: 243, 246 to 248, 251, 266, the English chief at 267, the Maratha subhedar of 268, 270, 271, 277, 278, transfer of factories to 278, 288, the Dutch at 371N.

Kuniyur, Plates, The. 153.

Kuppam 34.

Kurangu Durgam 85N.

Kurnool, District 34N, conquest of 106N, 358N, Nawab of 460, his discontent 471N, 486, 496, 408N, 505, 506, 511, 512, 513.

Kurumba tribe, The. (Curumba or Vaduga Idaiyar), 31N, 32N3, an account of 36, their land called Kurumbabhumi 37, the Corumbins 38, overthrown by Adondai 39, origin of the name 39, called Kurunilamannar 39, connected with the Kallans 40, 41, came from Vijayanagar 41, their original home 41, subjugation of 63, 64.

Kutbu'd-din, court darogah 368N.

Kutb Shahi, the 212.

Kuttarisi, Durgam 85N.

Kuvalayananda, a work of Appayya Dikshita 126N.

La Bourdonnais, his capture of Madras 465.

Lachman Rao 498N.

Laerzio, Fr. A. 70N.

Lake, Lord 450N.

Lakkana, nephew of Ballala IV 45N.

Lakkireddipalli 313N.

Lala Dakhni Roy. diwan peishkar 338, 353, 434.

Lala Todar Mal, sheristadar of the Nawab 338, 353, 356, 357.

LaTouche, French commander 476&N, 479N, 486, 487N1, 495, 507, 509, 513N.

Lally, Count de 521, 522, 523.

Lally Count de, the younger. 530.

Law, his report of the capture of Gingee 479N.

Lawrence, Major, his treatment of prisoners of war 20N.
his joining the Nizam 471N, 474.

Lehuraux, M. A. 489N1, 494N, 499, 513N.

Left Hand castes in Gingee 88N.

Lenormand M. 479N.

Leonidas, referred to 426.

Lespinais 218N.

Levanto, Fr. Nicholas, Rector of the Jesuit College at San Thome 109N, 110, 111.

Levi, Fr. Alexander at Krishnapatam 101.

Leyden, J. his collection 67N.

Lingama Nayaka, a feudatory of Krishnappa 102, 103, son of Chinna Bomma 103, his insubordination and attempt at independence 103-4, 106N, his rebellion 107, and defeat by Venkata of Kalahasti 107, 126N, 131N, his rebellion in 1603, 131N, and defeat at Minnal 131N, 187, his treachery to Madura in joining Shahji 186, his flight 188.

Lingappa, Podili, deputy of the Golkonda government 240, his exactions and threatening the English at Madras 240, 245, 276.

Lingayat pilgrims, 258.

Linschoten, Huyghen van, quoted 38, referred to 107.

Lisbon 96, 138N.

Louis XV. 119N1.

M

Ma'āthir-i-Ālamgiri 303N2.

Macauley, Ensign 493, 500, 530N.

MacGregor, at Gingee 524, 525, 628.

Mahfuz Khan 512.

Mackenzie, Col. Colin, his Collection of Mss. 23, 67, an account of his work 67&N, his work and death 67N, 201, 203, 206.

Maclagan E. referred to 70N.

Macleod, Col. William, Commissioner of Arcot 28N, 30, 68.

Macrae, Governor of Madras 447N.

Madagascar 218N.

Madanagiri (Krishnagiri) 88N.

Madanmast 352.

Madanna Pant: the Golkonda minister 211, his presents to Shivaji 213, 228, his plan of a Hindu Raj 228, his help to Shivaji 228, 232.

Madappollam 272N1.

Madras, 7, 37, grant of 59, surveyor-general of 67N, University of 67N, Presidency of 82N, 94, country 157, the English at 161, Council 162, records of 164, its neighbourhood 177, factors 177N, 178, 179, subjugation of 180, 207, 209, 214, records 220, 224, 228, 229, 230N, the English at 240, records 241, fortifications of 244, Governor of 320N, 321, the English at 324, 325&N2, Museum: Representation of Desing's fight 429, records 431, 435&N, construction of the fort of 447&N, Fort Square erected 447N, 458N, 461, capture of 465.

Madura 35, Sultans of 45, 46, 47N3. Nayaks of 48, Sultans of 57, conquests of 58, restoration of its temples 58, defeat of the Sultans of 58, 59,

reconsecration of its temple 62, Nayak of 64, 65, District 66, 67N, 74&N, Mission, founder of 70N, Nayaks : Tanjore victory over 76, 77, Nayaks' disloyalty 142 to 145, his submission 146, his alliance with Tanjore 146, 147, country devastated 148. 150, 152, 153, disservice to the empire 166, 167, Nayak's treachery again 176, 183, Muslim advance upon 186 to 189, attack on 320N, 358N, mission 452N, 456.

Madurāntakam 149.

Maertssen Arend, the Dutch factor 117, captured the Portuguese ships 117, his negotiation 117, got a letter from the Gingee Nayak to the Stadth holder of Holland 118.

Mahadevamangalam 313N.

Maharashtra 329, the power of 332, averting of civil war in 443, 456.

Mahe 523, 588.

Mailam, the original home of the Kurumbas 41, 489 N1, 513N.

Makaraju (Macaraju) 138, 139, 148.

Makha, Ismail Khan 288&N1, his allegiance to the Mughals 296, 297, defeated Jadhav 298, 299, his camp 300, imprisonment 306.

Makhdum Ali, 521; his victory 522.

Malabar 40, letters from 69, 70N, condition of 108.

Malayanūr 207.

Mālik Kāfur, Alau'd-din's general 14, 55, sack of Srirangam 60, 181N.

Malik Nemi, founder of the Madura Sultanate 57.

Malik Raihan, Mughal commander at Gingee 183.

Mallādevi, wife of Harihara II 52, 54, also called Mallambika and belonged to the Yadava family 54.

Mallappa Nayaka, Adappam 89.

Mallayya, *alias* Chinana Chetty 162, put down the Damarla brothers 162, an account of him 162-3, his peace with the Moors and his inimical attitude towards the Dutch 163. 164, his loss of territory 164, 172.

Malleson, G. B., referred to, 481 N1, 483.

Mallikarjungadh 449N.

Malliki Maidān, a piece of cannon 6.

Mallur 313N, North 317, 319.

Mambattu 88N.

Mamood Allee, English assistance to 272N1.

Manalurpet, 487N1, 509.

Mangammal, wife of Venkatappa Nayak of Gingee 88N. built tanks 88N.

Mangalore 421N.

Mānikkavāsagar, the great Saiva Saint 123N.

Manināgapura or Manikhpur, the home of the Gingee Nayaks 78.

Manjakuppam, under the Dutch 279, 280. spelt Mange Copang 281N1, affairs at 281N1, 285, 357, 370, 374N.

Mannur 313N.

Manoel, d'Oliveira, *alias* Egyb Hakim Ismail 274.

Manucci, Nicolo, the Venetian traveller 217, 321, 361N.

Maraiya Nayaka, son of Somappa, the general of Kamapana 50.

Marakatanagara 50, see also Vrinchipuram.

Marakkānam 21.

Marathas, The. (Mahrattas), their occupation of Gingee 8, their fortifications 16&N, 18, attack on Gingee 210-11, their ravages 249, 251, 252, disruption of 253, their army 257, 258&N1, Mughal army sent against them 261, threat

of 262, divided into two divisions 266, 280, their retreat to Gingee 287, attacked Zulfikhar Khan 288N, retreat 289, did havoc to the Mughal army in Gingee 291, their raid 294, help to Raja Ram at Gingee 297, their success in the south 299-309, 307, 308, their supremacy in the south 320N, 323, army in the south 324, victory over the Mughals 325N1, dissensions among 329, their sufferings 333, help to Raja Ram 336, 337N, forces 339, their panic in Gingee 341-2, their land 364, troubles 367, their march to Bednore 410N, war with Bednore 421, driven out of the Carnatic 440, first expedition into the south and exaction of tribute 441, disunion among them 441, second expedition 442, their aid to Bangaru 452N, expedition to the south 455-6, plunder of Arcot 456, their prisoner 467, their attack on the French 471N, pursuit of the French 474.

Mansabdars, 482; troops 507, 508, 510, help sought by Lally 523.

Marco Polo, the Venetian traveller, mentioned 200N.

Margry M. P. 218N.

Martello Towers 17.

Martin, François, got Pondicherry for the French 210, 215N, his *Memoires* 218&N, his account of Shivaji's Karnatak expedition 218N, *Memoires* 224, 228, 231 to 234&N, 293N2, 294, 225&N1, 320&N.

Martineau M. A., referred to 476, his account of the capture of Gingee 478-9, Editor of Martin's *Memoires* 320N.

Martinez, translator of Du Jarric's work 70N.

Marava country, The. 148, 152N, poligars submission to Zulfikhar Khan 351.

Marutam 37, fort built by the Kurumbas 63.

Mary, Queen of England 281N1.

Musaravakkam 313N.

**Masulipatam, arrival of Dutch ships at 112, 171, 243,
247, 272, Koti Bandar 360N.**

Maulana Azad, his account 494N.

Maurice Prince 118.

**Melacheri or the old Gingee village 15, 31, 96, killedars
of 335, 353, 410N, 425.**

Metcalf, capt. 280, 281&N1.

**Minakshi, Rani of Madura 452N, her quarrel 452, 454,
455.**

Minnal, battle of 107, (Munnali) 131N.

Miraj 456.

Mir Asad, the dewan 458N, see Mir Asadullah.

Mir Asadullah Khan, killedar of Chetput 470.

Mir Dayem Ali Khan, 505.

**Mir Jumla, the Golkonda minister 164, his alliance with
Bijapur 164, his renewal of the grant made
to the English 164, his march upon Gingee
165, alliance with Bijapur 165, his subse-
quent war with Bijapur 165, 169, his advance
172, his campaign against Gingee in 1648
173, his secret alliance with the Raya 173,
175, defeat of 175, his peace with Sriranga
175, entered service under Aurangzib and
got the jaghir of the Carnatic 176, opposition
to 177, his lieutenant, Tubaki Krishnappa
Nayaka 178, at Agra 179, an account of his
operations 183, secured the assistance of the
Bijapur army 183, raised the siege of
Gingee 183.**

Mir Sayfullah 505, 511.

Mirza Hasan Beg, killedar of Gingee 481N1.

Mohabat Khan, also **Mahabat Khan**, killedar of Valudāvur 382, 386, his preparation against the English 386-7, his fight with the English 391, his withdrawal 392, also spelt as **Mobet Khan** 408N, his help to Desing and death 410N, 426, 427, his fight 428, 430, his tomb 433, 435.

Mohan Singh, capture of 386.

Molhair, governor of 467N.

Moluccas 70N.

Monson, Major, 521, 522.

Montbrun, M. 489N1.

Moore, Major, 522.

Montague Mr. 315, captain 380.

Motupalli 358N.

Mubariz Khan, his death referred to 462.

Mughals, The. their empire 70N, their attacks 170, the Emperor and his supremacy in the South 177, their court at Agra 179, their disturbances in the South 246-8, their conquests in the South 250, 251, 252, Emperor 259, their southern occupations 261, their southern advance and victory 262, their siege of Gingee 286-350, help sent to Gingee 292, plan of the siege 295-6, failure 297, change in the plan of attack 297, failure and internal troubles 300, their hardships 301, 308-9, their retreat to Wandiwash 310, further attack on Gingee 311, dissensions in their camp 323, army's flight 324, the helplessness of the army 324-5, their capture of Gingee referred to 351, their dominion 374N, 407, their administration and its weakness 423.

Muhammad Abrar Khan 4807.

Muhammad Ali, the Nawab and his treatment of the French prisoners .20N, Nawab of Arcot 363N, son of Anwaru'd-din sent as hostage to the Nizam 463, his friendship with the English 466, summoned to oppose Muzaffar Jang 468, his joining Nasir Jang 470, 471N, completely routed by the French 471N, formal by English troops 473, his pass with the men defeat and flight 473, his letter to the English 475, his defeat at the hands of the French at Tiruvati 476, his flight to Gingee 476, at Gingee 477, his fight with the French 478, and defeat at Gingee 478-9. his attack on Gingee and retreat 486, 487N1, advice to the Nizam, 504, 506 his help, 588—16.

Muhammad Ali, the Qazi of Gingee 438.

Muhammadans of the South 50, 51, 57, 58, repulsion of 93, their cruelties 186, 447N.

Muhammad Mahfuz Khan, eldest son of Anwaru'd-din 466, his war with the English 466, left for Hyderabad 468.

Muhammad Khan 274.

Muhammad Khan Tashkandi, 494N.

Muhammad Said, Risaladar, 498N.

Muhammad Sadik in the East Coast 252.

Muhammad Shah, the Moghul Emperor 443, 446.

Muhammad Sayyid Kevud, sent to the south 332, 335, made dewan of Gingee 338, also called Muhammad Sayyid Khan, made dewan of Gingee 353, 356, 357, succeeded Daud Khan 360, 364, got the title of Sadatullah Khan 365&N, 366, 438N, (see Sadatullah Khan).

Muhammad Sayyid Khan, Sahib Zada ; son of Safdar Ali 458&N, 459, his submission to Asaf Jah 460, 462, 463&N.

Muhammad Sayyid Khan, nephew of Sadatullah 450.

Mulbagal country 48, 57.

Munro Major 523, 528.

Mungi Shevgaon, the Nizam's treaty at 441, 443.

Murari Rao, Maratha general 452N, 456, 458N, 471N, 498N, 510.

Murtaza Ali Khan, Ghulam 452, 458, his murder of Safdar Ali 458&N, and accession as Nawab 458&N, his machinations 462, his murder of the Boy-Prince 464, 502.

Mustafa Khan, Nawab, of Bijapur, Khan Baba his march to Seringapatam 157, 170, his campaign 171, 173, his misunderstanding with Shahji 174, 175, 183.

Mutawassil Khan, son-in-law of the Nizam and his claims 467, his order to Chanda Sahib 467&N.

Muthiālu Nayakkan of Gingee and builder of Venkataramanaswami Temple 7, 83&N, 87, his other building activities 88N, Mutyalu Nayakan 410N.

Muthumalla Reddi of Tindivanam, his troubles 465, 466.

Muthuvirappa Nayaka of Madura and the civil war 131, 143, 152&N.

Muzaffar Jang, Hidayat Mohiu'ddin Khan, grandson of the Nizam 467, joined Chanda Sahib 467N, his expedition 468, his triumphal entry into Pondicherry and conferment of honours on Ananda Ranga Pillai 469, his march towards Tanjore 469, his retreat to Tiruvati 470, his captivity in Nasir Jang's camp 470, French help to 471N, his surrender 471N, his attempt to escape 473, his troops 473, his submission to Nasir Jang and imprisonment 474, French

help for his release 476, 489N1, proclaimed
Nizam 509. 513N.

Muzaffar Khan, 486, 497, 498, 506.

Muzaffaru'd-din, see Khan-i-Khanan.

Mylapore, fortification and Daud Khan's bungalow at
360N, 449N.

Mysore, the Kurumbas of 39, 40, 41, ruler of 57, country
61, 74N, invasions of Bijapur 156, siege of
156, ruler 157, help to Sriranga III 161, alli-
ance sought 164, Raja's war with Bijapur
165, its help to the Empire 166, recognition
of its early independence 167, subdued
168, chiefs of 170, 175, death of its ruler 180,
her help to Sriranga referred to 181, Sri-
ranga's stay there as a refugee 181, Keshav
Pant's attack on 247, 248, ruler of 260, his
army's defeat 260, Balaghat country 325N,
Central Mysore 328, 358N, Nizam's march
through 446, Second Mysore war, 531.

N

Nāgamangala, chief of 155, 157.

Najaf Ali Khan, 494N495, 498.

Najib Khan, accompanied Anwaru'd-din to Arcot 468.

Nandagopala Pillai of Gingee 83N.

Nandi Krishnaji Pandit, gumasta of Sadatullah Khan
444, 445.

Nandyal 358N.

Napier, Lord 67N.

Napoleon, 531.

Narapa Razu 139.

Narasa Nayaka, founder of the III Vijayanagar dynasty
72, his conquests 72.

Narasimha II, the Hoysala 42, his victories 42, 43.

Narasimha III, the Hoysala 43.

Narasinga Raya, Saluva of Vijayanagar 35, 48, 59, his dominance over Gingee 80.

Narayana Kōn, *alias* Narayanan, author of *Karnataka Rajakkal Savisthara Charitam* referred to 23, 28&N, 31, 68, 72, 73, 74N, 85, 332, 334, 336, 352, 355, 360N, his account of Sarup Singh 365N, 369, 370, his account of Desing 410N, an estimate of his work 410N, account of Desing 420, 422, 424, 427, 434, his account 443, 447, 481N1, 487N1, 506, 512, 513N.

Narvarangam 497.

Narayanan, English agent 325N2.

Narayana Vilasa of Virupaksha, a Sanskrit drama 72.

Narmada, The 467.

Nasir Khan, Muhammad, the Bijapur governor of Gingee 207, 208, 214. his parentage 215N, 226, agreeing to Maratha terms 228, war with 232, his defeat 233, sought Golkonda help 233, 234&N.

Nasir Jang, second son of Asaf Jah, his advance towards the North 466-7, his rebellion 467N, his order to Dupleix 469, his opposition to Muzaffar Jang 469, his arrival at the Changuama Pass 470, his occupation of Gingee 470, his camp 470, joined by Muhammad Ali 470, his terms to Chanda Sahib 471&N, his movements and fight with the French 471N, his offer of help to Muhammad Ali 473, his march to Tiruvati 473, arrival of English help 474, Muzaffar Jang's submission to 474, his *farman* to the English 475, his descent on the Carnatic referred to 477&N, his camp 482-85, place of his martyrdom 489N1; its date 494N; account, etc., 494N1,—504, 505, 509—11—513.

- Nasrat Gaddah, Moghul name of Gingee 23, 338, 347,
353, Nawab's entry into 410N, 432.
- Nayaks, The. under Vijayanagar: their fortification of
Rajagiri 17, 65, origin of the term 77, as
governors 83N.
- Nazir Muhammad Khan 274.
- Nedungunram temple, built by Gingee Nayak 88N.
- Neganur 487N1, 507. Nemali 489N1.
- Negapatam 117, 207.
- Neill, General, hero of the Indian Mutiny, erection of
his statue in (1858) 8.
- Nellore 74, 81, 172, 181N, 313N.
- Nerkunam 489N1.
- Netherlands, The 118.
- Nickel Fr. 189, 191.
- Nieuhoff John quoted 65, 189.
- Nikitin A., a traveller 191.
- Nilakanta Pingle (The Peishwa) 257, 258.
- Nilakanta Sastri K. A., Prof. referred to 489N1.
- Nileswar 421N.
- Nilgiris. The Kurumbas of 38 to 40.
- Nilo Moreshwar Pingle, Raja Ram's Peishwa at Gingee
265, 288.
- Nilo Pant 258N2.
- Niraji Prahlad, the Maratha envoy 211, 212.
- Niraji Ranji 265.
- Niyamatullah Khan Khaja 461.
- Nivritti Sangam 213.
- Nizamu'l-Mulk, Asaf Jah 360, his appointment of
Sadatullah Khan to the Carnatic 438N, his
march to the south 443.
- Nizam Ali Khan, 487N1, 508.
- Nungambakkam, grant to the English 361, 447V.
- Nuniz, 74N, 189, 194.

O

Oba Raya, father-in-law of Venkata I, 98N.

O'Kennedy, 521N1.

Olivia, Paul 186, 188.

Ongole 172.

Oppert, Dr. G., referred to 38.

Orme, Robert, referred to 3, 4N, his plans 6, referred to 11, 15, 21, 31N2, 186, 188, his account of the capture of Gingee 228-9, 241, 245, 250, 334, referred to 458N, referred to 481N1, 489N1, 500, 501, 513N518N, & 525N.

Ottakuttan, a Tamil poet 123N.

P

Padaividu 32&N3, identified with Rajagambhira fort 49, 58, 197, 449N.

Padanda Rayar, *faujdar* of Gingee 437.

Padirikuppam 397, 402.

Padshah Bagh 410N.

Paes, referred to 189, 194 to 196.

Paḷamānēri village 144.

Palar, The. 27, 48, 65, 247, 248 to 251, 262, 361N, 437, 443.

Pālayamkōttai, battle between Yatiraja and Yachama 106N, 134N, battle of 146, 149, 207, fort 316. 449N1.

Palkhad, victory of 443.

Pallavas, The. their relation with the Kadavarayas 34N, with the Kurumbas 38, 39, their capital 42.

Balvat vanam 497.

Pandarum Pander Yembollum, damage done to 374N, 396.

Pandasolanallur, English capture of the people of 385.

Pandharpur temple 130.

- Pandyas, The. 27, 34N, territory of 43, conquest of 53^o
 their kingdom 58, rulers 58, 59, 62N, 72, 73;
 Tanjore victory over them 76, 77.
- Panhala fort, 225, 251, 255, captured by the Mughals
 256, 257, 258N2, 267.
- Papiaha, Rayasam 447N.
- Panruti 131N, 317, 517.
- Parakāla Nambi 51.
- Parali, Ramdas's shrine at 254.
- Parasnis, Mr. 247, 481N1.
- Paris 92N, Archives of 218&N, *Bibliothèque Nationale*
 489N1.
- Parsimungalem 408N.
- Pasupati Avaru, Brahman householders called 318.
- Pattabhi Ramaswami temple 7, 88N.
- Payne, Mr. C. H. 70N.
- Pedda Nayudu, his defeat 149.
- Peddapalayam (Periyapalayam), its siezure 177.
- Pedrapolur 513N.
- Pegu 70N.
- Pelakuppur fortress 34.
- Pennar, The South 34N, 102, 181N, North 248, 358N.
- Pennattūr 336, jaghir granted to Venkatapati 438, 449N.
 465, 487N1, 513N, 522.
- Penukonda 41, siege of, referred to 93, 131N, 149, 153N,
 154, capture of 165, loss of 175, fall of 261. 328.
- Periya Aiya, poligar 465, his confinement 465, and
 escape 465.
- Perimby, 489N1, 513N; 522.
- Periyapettai 88N.
- Peria Tirumozhi* of Tirumangai Alwar 123N.
- Perambur, granted to the English 458N.

Perumukkal 31, called Permacoil by Orme ; and its fortifications 31N2, conquest of 314, 449N, English capture of, 521, 531.

Perron, Anquetil du, a French traveller 66, 69, 70N, his discovery of the *Avesta* 70N, translator of the *Upnishads* 75, 92&N, his life 92N, called Abraham Hyacinthe 92N, 93, 104, 107.

Perseram Pandit 329N.

Perumbarrapuliyur, another name for Chidambaram 123N.

Phaltan 255.

Philip III of Portugal 109N, his letter to Venkata I 109N, 111.

Phonda (near Goa) 218N.

Pichavaram, poligar of 103N.

Pigot Mr., Governor of Madras 20, 523, 529.

Pillailōkam Jiyar, author of *Divyasuri Charitam* 123N.

Pimenta, Fr. Nicholas, referred to 9, 10, 15, 66, 69, his visit to Gingee 69, 70N, his life 70N, and death 70N, 92, 95&N, 96, his meeting Krishnappa Nayaka 96, his description of Gingee 96, 97-101, 98&N, 99, 100, 102, 103, 120, 121, 191, 192 to 195, 200, 203.

Pina Virabhadra, Pillalamarri, author of *Jaimini Bharatam* 59.

Pindaris, The. 174, employed in the siege of Gingee 185.

Pingalamuni, the Tamil lexicographer 39.

Pitt, Thomas 325N2, Governor of Madras 361N, 374, 407.

Place de la République at Pondicherry where Dupleix's statue was erected.

Polu, a servant woman 318.

Polur 32, 449N, 468, 470.

Pondicherry, gate, on the east of the Gingee fort, named as such 4, 6, 520, 525N1, 526, Pondicherry 7, advance of Coote against 31N2, fall of

referred to 92N, 165, looted 174, 185, 208, 210, its foundations 210, (Pullacherry) captured by Shivaji 210, 218&N, 231, 232, 236, 251, the French allowed to colonise at 262, raid near 263, 274, 275, 288, the French at 288, 289, 294, Pondicherry gate of Gingee 295, bombardment of 296, 314, governor of 320&N, Dutch capture of 320&N, French governor of 374, 390, 401, 403, the French at 431, 461, 465, attack on 466, 468, 469, 470, French retreat to 471N, French camp near 473, French retreat to 474, 477N, 498, 502, 503, siege of 522, 523, fall of 524, destruction of fortifications 529.

Poona 257, 336, 337, Chanda Sahib a prisoner at 467.

Poonamalle 94, 157, (Pundamallee) 177N, subjugation of 178, fight near 179, 180, ruler of 248, 250, Mughal capture of 252, 261, 449N, grant of 474, 475.

Porto Novo 100, 112, 118, 131N, 165, looted 174, 185, 192, 203, 208, abandoned by the Dutch 236, Dutch re-obtained it in 1680; 237, 238, the English to found a factory at 240, 241, import duties 242, 244, 248, English factory closed down 251, 263, 270, called Muhammad Bandar 272N1, 275 to 277, English factory opened at 278, gate 348, English ships captured near 379, taken possession of by Sarup Singh 408&N.

Portugal 96, King of 109N.

Portuguese, The. their relations with Gingee 107, their expulsion from the west coast of India 108, rivals of the Dutch 110 111, their fortunes 112, relations with Gingee 112, turn in their affairs 113, 115, concession at Tegnapatam 116, driven away from the coast 116, 117, their intrigues 119, called Pārasikas : their

part in the civil war 142, 147N, fight with 421N.

Pota Bhupala, father of Surappa Nayaka 90.

Poysaleswara temple 43.

Powney, Henry, 503.

Prahlad Niraji, Maratha chief justice 253, 254, 257, 258, appointed regent 264, had no power under Rajaram 265, 268.

Prapannamṛtam, referred to 122, 123, 126N.

Pratapa Rudra, defeat of 60.

Pratapgarh (Pratapgad) 254, fort of 259N2.

Preston, Major, 523, 524, 528.

Prisoners' Well 9.

Proenza, Fr. 152, 181, 186, 188, 189, 191.

Pudupauk, granted to the English 458N.

Pulalkottam 37.

Puliakon (Palliya Kon) of the Kon dynasty 31N, 32, Puliyan 33N1.

Pulicat, (Paliacate) 109N, 119, 147N, the Dutch Governor of 162, Golkonda attack on 162, 163, Sriranga's siege of 177&N, conquest of 178, the Dutch at 180, 207, 237, 299.

Punjab , the 367.

Puṇyakōtīswara temple 51.

Puṇyakōti Vimana set up by Krishnadeva Raya 129

Purān Chand, diwan 461.

Purasawakam, grant of 325N2, 449, scare at 361N, 447N.

Pushpagiri 32N3.

Puttanandal 489N1, 513N.

Pumyarin, Dragoons under 479N, 530.

Q

Qasim Khan, sent against the Marathas 261.

Qazi Daim (Dayem Ali Khan) 498N, 510.

Quranic Law, provision for administration of 207.

Queyroz, quoted 137, 139.

R

Raghava Iyengar, Rao Sahib M., referred to 79N.

Raghuji Pantulu 268, 372N1.

Raghuji Bhonsle. his expedition 452N, 455, 456, his power 457.

Raghunāthābhyudayam, The. 66. 75N, 76, 93, 102, 103, 134, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144N1.

Raghunāthābhyudayam, of Vijayaraghava 144N2, 146.

Raghunātha Vilāsa Nātakam, The. referred to 146.

Raghunatha Nayak of Tanjore, author 75N, his exploits 76, 77, 91, 92, 93, his part in the release of the Gingee Nayak from imprisonment 93, 95, 104, his help to the Gingee Nayak 131N, his loyalty to the Emperor Rama 135, 142, 143, his fight 144, 145, his victory 145, 146, his further victories 146, 149, 150,

Raghunatha Pandit, subhedar of Gingee 240.

Raghunatha Pant 214, his agreement with the captain of Gingee 214, 215N.

Rahmatulla Khan 498N.

Raigad, fort in the Konkan 222, 225, 239, 253, 254, captured by the Mughals 255, 256, 259N2, (Raigarh) 260, invested 286, Zulfikar's victory at 287.

Rairee 229.

Rajagambhīram, fortress of 49, also called Rajagambirama-
malai : capture of 49.

Rajagiri, also known as Kamalagiri and Anandagiri : one of the citadels of Gingee 2, 3, also called the Great Mountain 4, description of 4, 5, springs at 10, 11, 14, 15, fortified by the Vijayanagar Nayaks 17 to 49, temple at the base of 22. Ramaswami temple in 85N, 88N,

name given to Anandagiri by Krishnappa Nayaka 85N, 201, 206, 296, 333, 334, Todarmal's encampment at 424, date of Gingee's fall engraved upon 434, 438, Mughal prince's arrival at 446, 465, 478, scaling up the walls of 479N, 481N1, 525N, 527, 530.

Rajagopālaswāmi temple at Gingee 85N, identified with Venkataramanaswami temple 85N.

Raja-karanampēttai 88N.

Rajahmundry 462.

Raja Raja Cholan Ula 122.

Raja Raja Chola III 123N.

Raja Ram, ruler of Gingee 8.

Raja Ram, second son of Shivaji: his rule in Gingee 225, 238, 239, Sambhaji's younger brother; his arrival in the south 253. appointed regent 253, 254&N, his march to Pratapgad and his fight with the Mughals 254-5, besieged 255, 256, his march upon Gingee 257, at Bangalore 258&Nn1&2, an account and date of his advance 258N2, 263. asked to assume authority on Sahu's imprisonment 264, his attempt to unify the Marathas as against the Mughals 264, his council of ministers at Gingee 265, 266. his financial difficulties 266, his anxiety to sell Devanampatnam 267, 268-9, 270, sold it to the English 271, 272&N1, his *farman* to the English 272N1, 278, also called Rama Raja 279, his granting of a *farman* to the English 279, Dutch complaint to 280, 281N1, 285, his leaving for Tanjore 287, despatched an army to obstruct the Mughals 287, 288, at Tanjore 289, his return to Gingee 290, 291, 294, 295&N1, Maratha help to 297, 299, his proclamation 300, and Kam Baksh 301, 303, 307, 309, 315, his seizure of the forts in the south

316, 320N, his demand of a heavy sum of money from the English 329N, 323, the friendly attitude of the Dutch towards him 324, 325N2, 329, his petition to Aurangzib 329, 330, 331, escaped to Vellore 332, 333, his family invested 333 to 335, his escape to Poona 336, 337N, bribed 338, 341, 347, 351, 370, his *cowle* to the English 374, 410N, 433.

Rajanatha Dindima, author, 59.

Rajapur. 218N.

Raja Udayar of Mysore 152, his capture of Seringapatam 154, 155.

Rajendra Chola I 27.

Rajendra Chola III 34N, defeated by Someswara 42. 43N.

Rajputs, troubles from the : 367, their rule in Gingee 436, 437, 451.

Ramabhadramba, a Tanjore poetess 75N. 76. 144N1.

Ramachandra, Sen, 510.

Ramachandra Amatya 255, 257.

Ramachandra Bavdekar. the commander of Maharashtra 266.

Ramachandra Nayaka of Gingee, Achyutha Vijaya 83, a mahamandaleswara 87&N, built the gopura at Tiruvannamalai 88N.

Ramachandra, the Yadava ruler 54.

Ramadeva of Vijayanagar. his family 52. Mallambika belonged to this family 54, 94.

Ramadeva I, brother of Venkata I and viceroy of Seringapatam 135N, his two sons 135N.

Ramadeva II, son of Sriranga 135&N. crowned as emperor at Kumbakonam 135N, 142, 147N, 150.

Ramagopalaswami temple at Gingee 85N.

Ramakrishna Payya, the recorder of Gingee 356, 410N. 422, 427. 437.

Ramakrishna Kavi, of Tenali, mentioned 130.

Ramalinga, a friend of the English 355.

Ramdas, Raja, 505, 509.

Ramnad' poligars of, their submission to Zulfikar Khan 352.

Ramanatha 43, see also Vira Ramanatha.

Ramanuja, founder of Srivaishnavism 79N, his consecration of Govindaraja at Lower Tirupati 79N, 122, his uncle 129.

Ramanuja Divya Charitai, mentioned, 123N.

Ramapuram, English capture of, the people of 385.

Rama Rao 318.

Rama Raya of Vijayanagar: his coronation at Vellore 106N. his grant to the English referred, to, 402.

Rama Raya, lieutenant of Achyutaraya 123N, 126N.

Rama Chetty, builder of Chettikulam, 8, 410N, 433.

Rama Singh Hada.. 329, 330.

Ramaswami temple in Rajagiri 85N.

Rama, temple at Padaividu 32N3

Ramayana, scenes from the, depicted on the walls of the Venkataramanaswami temple 7.

Rameswaram, 46, 66, 188, 254N, 258N1, 374N.

Ramchand Hada 334.

Ramchand Pandit, Rajaram's minister 329N.

Ramje Nalage, appointed to be in charge of Gingee 216.

Ram Raja, ruler of Gingee 16N.

Rampur 449N.

Ranade, referred to 232.

Ranadulla Khan the Bijapur general 156, 157, 160, 167, 358N.

Ranga I of Vijayanaker, 90,

Rangacharya Prof. V, referred to, 91, 92, 181N.

Ranganatha temple, on the top of Rajagiri 5, 11, the shrine at Singavaram 12, 14, 61, tutelary god of Desing 424, 427.

Ranga Raja, author of *Satvikabrahma Vidya Vilasa* 190.

Ranipettai : founded by Sadatullah Khan 433.

Ranjangudi 449N, 506.

Ranoo, Santaji's son, 329.

Rauf Khan of Gingee, 214, 215N,

Ravilla Venka, 148,

Ravuttanallur 449N, 497.

Raworth, Robert, 374, took possession of Fort St. David
390, sent to negotiate peace 392, 393, 399,
401, 403, 408N.

Rayachoti 469.

Raya Mahal of Gingee, The, 85N,

Rayas of Vijayanagar, The, their fortification of Gingee.
16N.

Raza Ali, Chanda Sahib's son 468, his help to Anwaru'd-
din 468,

Razaak Abdur, the traveller 191, 200N.

Red Hills Lake, 37.

Renukambal temple, 32N3.

Right Hand castes in Gingee, The, 88N.

Roach, Capt., 374, 382, 387, 391XN, attacked 392, his
plunder 406.

Roberts, Gabriel, Governor of Fort. St. David, 373, 378.
379, 381, 396, 400, 405N.

Roe. Sir. Thomas, his reference to the betel, 200N.

Rouvray M. de, 479N.

Royal Asiatic Society. The, 67N.

Rubino, Fr. referred to, 145.

Rudraji Salvi, an officer 216.

Rupaji the Bhosle freebooter 266.

Rupa Chand, Diwan, 444.

Rup Nayak of Gingee 184.

S

Sadasivaraya of Vijayanagar 29, his epigraph, 200.

Sadat Namah The, also *Said Namah*: biography of Sadatullah Khan 361&N.

Sadat Tiyar Khan: appointed killedar of Gingee, 434, 437, 438' his strife with Abdul Nabi Khan and death 440, 447. 451, his death 464,

Sadatullah Khan' his mosque 6, his fight with Desing referred to 12, 18, 353, 358N, 360&N, 363, his origin 364, his personality 364, sought service under Aurangzib 364, *mansabdar* 364, accompanied Daud Khan to the Carnatic 365, his official life 365, his praiseworthy rule 365&N, 366, made Sarup Singh his diwan 367, his report to the Emperor of Sarup Singh's non-payment of arrears 367-8, 368&N, 382N, 384, his territory plundered 408, 410N, his march on Gingee 410N, sent an army against Desing 410N, 417, 418, 420, 423, his struggle with Desing 423, 427, his desire to capture Desing alive 428, his capture of Gingee 429, 430, his victory referred to 431, his entry into Gingee 432, his clemency 433, his building of a town in memory of Desing's wife near Arcot 433, his organisation of affairs at Gingee 438, his retrimment from Gingee 438, his rule in Gingee referred to 439, opposed Abdul Nabi Khan 440, The Nizam's march into the subah of 443, his submission of accounts to the Nizam 444, 445N, The Nizam's conferment of honours upon 446, his letter to the Emperor regarding a Mughal prince 446, his organisation of the *killas* and death 449, his titles 449-50,

Sadras, The Dutch at 208, Sadraspatam 371N.

- Safdar Ali Khan, nephew of Sadatullah, 442N, 452&N, 454, 456, Nawab 457, his bravery admired 457 his murder 458&N, sons 459, his mother 463N killed 464.
- Safshikan Khan, 498N
- Sagar 311.
- Sahityaratnakara*, The. 66, 75N, 76, 93, 102, 103, 134, 140, 142, 144N1.
- Sahu, his imprisonment, 264.
- Saint George, M. 479N.
- Saint, Marc. French sergeant 477&N.
- Saiya Bai, Shivaji's first wife, 238.
- Saiyad Khan, the Tanjore adventurer 452N.
- Salabat Khan 410N.
- Salabat Jang, 487N1, 508.
- Salem 155.
- Salim Khan 337N, brother of Daud Khan Panni 348, his attack on Cuddalore 348, second attack 349, his plunders 349.
- Saluva Mangu 48, 50, 59, 62&N.
- Samayavaram, Gopanarya's defeat of the Muhammadans at 61.
- Sambhaji, his dismissal of Raghunatha Pant 237, alleged rumour of his death 238, appointed his brother-in-law to Gingee 238&N, plots against 239, English appeal to 242, grant of privileges to the English 242, 245, sent garrisons to the south 245, his order to Harji Raja 250, 251, his war with the Mughals 251, captured by the Mughals 252, execution of 252N, his council of ministers 253, 254, 256, plots against 260, sent an army against Mahadik 261, his death in 1689 referred to 263, Mughal capture of his family 287.
- Sambhaji, the Maratha prince won over by the Nizam 441, 442 set up against Shahu by the Nizam 442N.

Sambuvarayar chief 49, 50, defeat of the Sambuvarayans 58, 59.

Sammanamānavar, a distinction bestowed upon the shepherds by Anandakon 31N.

Sampat Rao, 512.

Sandur, Mahratta outpost in 442N.

Sangama, father of Bukkaraya 52, 54.

Sangita Sudha, The, 75N.

Sanjivi, the panacea of Hindu mythology ; considered as the root of the name Senji and Gingee 22.

Sankarapuram 449N.

Santaji, half-brother of Shivaji 221, 224, in charge of Gingee 236.

Santavasal village 32N3.

San Thome, the Missionary college at 98N, 109N, Bishop of 110, conquest of 180, the French at 208, siege of 218N, 361N, 447N.

Sarasangupettai (Nasir Jangai-Konrapettai ?) 489N1, 500.

Sardesai, Rao Bahadur G. S. referred to 227.

Sarfoji of Tanjore, attacked 440, his appeal to Satara 440.

Sarkar, Sir J. N. referred to 174, 211, 214N, 215N, 223N, 226, 230, his views on Shivaji's southern expedition 230, 258N2, 292, 297, 311, 312, 314, 331, 332, his date for the fall of Gingee 342, 343, 344.

Sarup Singh, a Bundela chief and a Rajput: Raja of Gingee 351, got Gingee from Aurangzib, 354, an account of his early life 354, became *killedar* of Gingee in A.D. 1700, 355 his officers 356, his administration 356, 357, his later quarrels with the English 357, his death in A.D. 1714, 367, arrest of his agent 368&N, 369, also spelt Surop Singh, Seroop Singh 369, and Syroop Singh 370, his capture of English officials 373, 374N, his bad treatment of the English captives

and greed for money 382&N, his demand of a ransom 383, 384, his adamant attitude in not releasing the English prisoners 384-5, causes for his stiffness and fight 390-1, 396, his action justified 397, 398, 399, peace with the English and its terms 402, 403, causes for the treaty with the English 404-7, his death in A.D. 1713-14, 407, 408&N, 409, 410&N, his death referred to 418. his sons 419, his quarrel with the English Council at Fort St. David 419, 420, 421, 423, his neglect to pay off the arrears referred to 423, 426, his reign in A.D. 1713, 429, his son, 430, 431, his nephew 433, 447.

Sarvagna Lingama Nayudu, Yacha's younger brother 149.

Satara 214, 440, 442N, 456,

Satghar fort, 313, 315, 337N, 449N, Satgadh 459.

Sattangadu 361N, granted to the English 447N.

Satyamangalam, Plates 54, Mysore capture of 157.

Satyanatha Aiyar, Mr. R. referred to 181N.

Satyavedu 449N.

Sauinders, Governor 503, 515.

Saudiancopang, granted to the English 458N.

Savanadrug 168.

Savanur Bankapur 358N, 445N, Nawab of 471N.

Sayana Udayar, son of Bukka: 51, his rule in the South 51.

Sayyid Amber Khan, the faujdar of the Carnatic, 206, his sons 214N, 215N, Maratha treaty with 226.

Sayyid Lashkar Khan, his supply of provisions to Zul-fikar 291, his post in the seige of Gingee 296, 297.

Sayyid Hussain Ali and his fight 360.

Sayyid Muhammad Khan, 451.

Sayyid Nasir Khan of Gingee 206,

Sayyid Brothers, the 367.

Schopenhauer, the German philosopher 70N.

Scott, Major referred to 293N2, 298, his date for the fall of Gingee 343.

Semmandalam, the Nawab's camp at, 519.

Senal, 489N1.

Senji: old name of Gingee and called so after the name of the goddess of the place 5, 21, Tamil name 24.

Senjiamman, the virgin goddess of Gingee 5. identified with Kamalakkanni Amman 5, 22,

Sendamangalam: (Chentamangalam): fort built by Kobilingam 31N, 34&N, 35, headquarters of Kopperunjinga 35.

Sen, Dr. S. N. referred to 231.

Sera, also Sira, Mussalman capture of 156, Nayak killed 168, Mughal governor of and his defeat 325N1, 358N, Maratha outpost in 442N, 446.

Serappa, Checca, the Company's merchant 374N, his influence 390.

Seringapatam, capture of 152, 154, 155, siege of 156, 157, 168, robbed 230N, tribute enacted from 441, II Maratha expedition called after this 442N.

Seshadri Aiyangar, Nallan Chakravarti, *Rajaguru* of Tubaki Krishnappa Nayaka 88N.

Seven Pagodas, The, 109N.

Sewell, Robert, referred to 74N, 138, 142.

Shah Alam, his succession 301, 307, 450N.

Shahbeg Khan, 498N.

Shah Nawaz Khan, 494N, 498N, 509, 513.

Shah Jahan, confirmed Mir Jumla in possession of the Carnatic 176.

Shahji, the Maratha general of Bijapur 153N, his death in A.D. 1664, 166, saved the Hindu empire 167, 168, got Bangalore 168, subdued Mysore 168, attacked Kenga Hanuma 168, his attempt to form a confederacy of the southern Nayaks 168, 169, his power in A.D. 1648, 169, and Sriranga 170, his imprisonment at Bijapur and release 170, in Gingee 173, 174, events leading to his arrest 174, his power in the south 174, 175, his victory over Mir Jumla 175, 180, his advance to Gingee 180, 183, 187, his part in the conquest of Gingee 187, his attack on Trichinopoly and flight to Tanjore 188, father of Shivaji 358N.

Shahji II, Raja of Tanjore 316, his submission to the Moghuls 316.

Shahu, Maharaja of Satara, his help to Sarfoji 440, 441, 442N. his desire to annex the south 442N, Nizam's war upon 443, 455, his southern expedition 456,

Shaikh Abdul Khadir the *Quazi* of the Padshah, 438, Shaikh, Nur, 356, 357.

Shaitan Dari, gate of Gingee 296, 330, 334.

Shamji Nayak Punde, 238, his imprisonment 239, at Gingee 260.

Shamsullah Qadir 494N, 495. 498.

Shankarji Malhar Rao, 265.

Sher Khan Lodi, of Valikandapuram. 215, Martin's ally 218N, 228, his war with Gingee 232, 233.

Sheva Reddi Nayak, a trader 373. 374N, 377, 379.

Shikar Udaya Ram, the *jupyanavis*, 356.

Shivaji (also Sivaji), the Great Maratha : his campaign in the South 16, his fortification of Gingee 16N, his rebellion 174, 185. his Karnatak

expedition 188, his attack on Gingee 210, got help from Golkonda 211, his plunder of Bijapur 211, his alliance with Bahlol Khan, and with Golkonda 211, his relations with Golkonda 212, his starting on the Karnatak expedition 212, his alliance with Golkonda 213, his assurance to Golkonda and Bijapur 213, his route 213, built the Ganesh Ghat on the banks of the Krishna and visited Srisailla 214, his entry into the Carnatic 214, his arrival at Gingee and capture of it 215, an account of its capture 215N, 216, 217, his works at various places 417, 218N, the English fear of 220, his letter to the English 220-1, his capture of Vellore 221, his fortification of Gingee 223-4, 225, his capture of Gingee recalled 226, his Carnatic expedition 226, his claims on the south 227, and Madanna Pant 228 as the commander of Golkonda forces 228, 229, the object of his expedition 230, causes that led to his expedition and the help of Golkonda therefore 233-4, his treachery to Golkonda 234&N, 235, his organisation of Gingee 236, his death in A.D. 1680, 237, the condition of Gingee at the time of his death 237, his daughter 238N, his wife 239, 253, 254N, 256, 358N, his country 276.

Shivaji, son of Sambhaji 253, chosen as ruler 253, 254&N, captured by the Mughals 255.

Shivnath Singh, made *killedar* of Gingee, 352, a follower of Jaipur Raja 353, 354.

Sholinghur, Mahacharya or Doddacharya of; and his part in the consecration of the Govindaraja, shrine 79N, 123N.

Silatgadh, 497.

Siddavaram, 313N.

Siddhi Raihan, commander 183.

Sidhout, 358N.

Sikhs, troubles from the 367.

Simhalas, The, conquest of 52.

Simon de Sa, Rector of the Jesuit College at San Thome 98N.

Singarampettai 88N.

Singavaram shrine 12, identified with Bishun Gingee (Vishnu Gingee) 13, 14, 22, 24N2, its origin 25N, earliest mention in a Chola epigraph as Singapura Nadu 27, connection with Srirangam 55, 61, Adivaraha temple at 71, 88N, 107, hill 296, 300, 427, 481N1.

Sirukadambur 88N, temple built by Tubaki Krishnappa 88N, 465,

Sittamur, the stone car-stand at 7, inhabited by the Jains 7. temple built by the Jains 88N, 316, 513N1.

Sivaganga, Poligar of and his submission to Zulfikar 352, 452N,

Sivanath, the recipient of the Gingee jaghir 15.

Sivappa Nayaka of Ikkeri 160, his help to Sriranga III, 160, his success 160, 161 hostility to Shahji 169, 172, 173, got honours from Sriranga 173, 176.

Smith, Captain Stephen 521, 524, 527, 529.

S'olaga of the Collroon, his defeat 76, 100 also known as Salavacha 102, ruler of Devikóttai 102, an account of 102, his attitude towards the Jesuits 103, his descendants 103N, family title of S'olaganar 103N, 131N.

Somappa, general of Kampana, 50.

Somasekhara Nayaka, Raja 421N,

Somaya Dandanayaka the Mahapradhani of Kampana,
49. See Somappa.

Someswara, see Vira Someswara the Hoysala.

Somerville Ensign 374, his base conduct 391&N, his flight
392.

Sornay the French engineer, 479N.

Sorya Bai, Shivaji's wife 239, her desire to secure the
throne for her son 239.

South Arcot Dt. Collector of 8, 24N, under the Cholas
27, 34N, 51, District 54, 55, 72, 80, 106N,
131N, 146.

Spain, King of 111,

Srikaracharya Kalgankar 265.

Srimushnam temple, built by Tubaki Krishnappa Nayaka
85, image of Krishnappa Nayaka, at 86.
sculptures in the temple of 202, 316.

Srinivasa Dikshita Ratnakhita, author, 90,

Sri Ram, *Huzur Amani*, 356.

Srirangam 14, 43, temple 50, 51, sack of 55, 60, 61 resto-
ration of its temple 58, date of its consecra-
tion 62, gifts to 62, 123N, 144.

Sriranga Raya III of Vijayanagar, 123N, 152, his war
with Mysore 152-3, his flight to Ikkeri 160,
honoured Sivappa Nayaka 160, 161, his
friendly attitude towards the English 161-2,
confirmation of the grant of Madras in
A. D. 1645., 162, 163, his success over the
Golkonda forces 163, attacked by Bijapur
and Golkonda forces 164, his flight 164
his refuge in Mysore 165, his second flight
from the capital 166, the condition of the
empire at the time of his accession 166-7,
170, alliance with Bijapur 170, his determi-
ned opposition towards the Mussalmans 171,
forced to flee 171, attacked 172, betrayed 172,
sought the help of the Ikkeri Nayaka 172.

his restoration 173, 175, his appeal to Aurangzib 175, peace with Bijapur 175, his subsequent fortunes 176, 177, his recovery 177N, his defeat 178, his conquest of Tirupati and other places 178, his request to the Dutch 179, his last attempts to gain power 180, 181, his failure to achieve anything 181&N, his epigraphs 197, 205.

Sriranga the nephew of Venkata I; appointed Raya 133, supported by Yachama Nayaka 134, murder of 134, his son, Rama 135, chosen heir 135N, his short rule 135&N, 137, 138, 139 his murder 141, 143, 146,

Srisaila, God Mallikarjuna of 214.

Sripat Rao the Maratha *Pratinidhi*, 441.

Stalakaranampettai 88N.

St. George's Mountain, present name of Chandrayan Drug 3. 526,-29.

St. Thomas 523.

Sulupgadh 449N.

Sunda, Raja Ram at, 257.

Sundara Balaji, the subhedar of Kunimedu 268, his negotiations with the English 268-9, 270.

Sundara Pandya I, 34N, 55.

Sunku Rama, the Company's merchant, 447N.

Surappa Nayaka of Gingee, his epigraph 78, called lord of Maninagapura 78, his relationship with the Gingee Nayaks 78, 89, called Adappam Surappa Krishnama 89, his ancestors and brothers 90, his help to Vijayanagar 90, difficulty in fixing his chronology 90, governor of Tiruvati 198.

Surat, 217, 218N, 227, 230N, 244.

Surman, John, his letter referred to 430, his embassy to the Emperor 447N,

T

Tabari, the Muhammadan historian, 364.

Tadpatri 451, 510.

Takkayāgapparaṇi by Otta kuttan 123N.

Talikota battle of 90, (Rakhas Tagdi) 181N, 204.

Talkanoor 497.

Tamarappakkam 449N.

Tamil country, the 55, 59, 62, 63, 71, the Nayaks of 143.

Tandore, grant of 325N2.

Tanjore, road leading to 32, District 34N, 35, Nayaks of 48, under Sayana Udayar 51, Nayaks of 64, 65, 72, 74&N, sources for their history 75N, palace: description of 76, Nayaks 77, 91 to 93, 95, 101, 104, 107, sought the help of the Dutch 117, union with Madura 146, 149, joined Tirumala, but later on severed connection 159, loyalty to Vijayanagar 159, and Shahji 169, 170, 171, joining Madura and betrayal 172, 175, attacked and plundered by Bijapur 180, Muslim advance upon 186, 189, its tribute 190, Nayak of 200N, 205, Shivaji's capture of 222, its ruler 226, 230N, 233, 234, Nayak of 260, Raja of 287, Raja Ram's request for help 287, migration of people to 288, 289, Raja of 290, his help to Rama Raya 299, Zulfikar's march towards 294, 295, 314, 315, Raja of 316, 320N, tribute from 328, Zulfikar at 357, 358N, Raja of 365N, 440, Bhonsla line 442N, capture of, by Chanda Sahib 452, anarchy 452N, 456, Anwaruddin's march towards 466, Muzaffar Jang's march towards 469, raising siege of Tanjore 470, 477.

Tanyal 489N.

Tadikāra Virappan. the valiant protector of the virgin sisters, 22.

Taqi AliKhan, killedar of Wandiwash 452

Tarani Singh, Desing's uncle and his rule in Gingee 369, 420,

Tātāchārya, Tirumala : the great Vaishnava teacher 120, 126N, his religious zeal 126N, 128, called Ettur Kumara Tirumala Tatacharya 128, also called Lakshmi Kumara and Kotikanyādāna and Venkataraya Tatacharya, on account of his influence in the court of Venkata I 128, royal guru and manager of Vishnu temples 128, his magnificence 128, identified with Tatarya, great grandson of Srinivasa 129, his works 129, 130.

Tātasamudram, tank dug by Tatacharya 129.

Taylor Rev. William : author of the *Catalogue Raisonné* 2, Referred to and his summary of *Karnataka Rajakkalcharitam* quoted 28N, 67N, 74N.

Tegnapatam, also known as Devanampatnam, the present Fort St. David 108, 109 also spelt as Tevanampatnam and Taunapatam in the Portuguese records 109N, 110, 111, 112, arrival of the Dutch ships at 112, 113, the Dutch at 114, fort of 115&N, Nayak of 116, renewal of the old *cowle* 117, capture of the Portuguese ships at 117, 118, 119, captured by the Bijapur forces 165, looted 174, 185, fort 192, abandoned by the Dutch 237, granted to the English 242, 249, 250, Harji's retreat to 262. See also Fort. St. David & Devanampatnam.

Tejonath Singh, 15.

Tellar 489N1.

Tennēri taluk 129.

Terrill, Lewis : his account of the siege of Gingee 303, 307,

Tērani Sing, father of Desing 369, 417, 419, 420.

- Tikka, the Telugu Chola chief, 42.
- Tillai Mūvāyiravar of Chidambaram 123N.
- Timaji Keshav 216.
- Timiri, 365N, 410N, 449N, 513N1.
- Timmaji Nayak appointed subhedar of Gingee, 264.
- Timmappayan Durgam 449N.
- Timma Naique 138,
- Tindivanam, road leading to 6, 31&N2, Vishnu temple built by Ramachandra Nayaka of Gingee 88N, Siva shrine at 88N, 202, 277, 314, 356, 357, 465, 466, 486N1.
- Tippu Sultan, his capture of Gingee 83N.
- Tipudas, agent of Sadatullah 368N.
- Tirukkaḷākkudi 51.
- Tirukkovaigar*, a Saiva work 123N.
- Tirukoyilur taluk, 34&N, temple built by Tubaki Krishnappa Nayaka 85, image of Krishnappa Nayaka 86, taluk 89, sculptures at 202, 328, 356, 357.
- Tirumala Nayaka of Madura: his accession and insubordination 152&N, 153&N, 157, and Kongu 157, and Sriranga III 159, his union with the other Nayaks 159, his appeal to Golkonda 159, 166, 167, 169, his treachery 172, his march to Gingee 173, his death 180, his opposition to Sriranga 181, his treachery 181N, his help to Gingee 183, 186, his successor 187, 205, his policy referred to 206.
- Tirumala, Bangaru of Madura 452N, his treachery 452N, 453. 454.
- Tirumalaraya of Vijayanagar 90.
- Tirumalipatam (Tirumalarayanpatnam) 117.
- Tirumangai Ālwār, the Vaishnava saint. 123N.
- Tirumullaivāsāl, Trimlivasal, 272N1.

Tirunagari, 74N.

Tirunāmanallūr 316.

Tirupāpuliyūr (Cuddalore N. T.) castle, 114, 115&N, 116,
to 119, 357, 370, 374N, 386, people of 387,
400.

Tirupassur 449N.

Tirupati, 61, Lower 79N, consecration of Govindaraja by
Ramanuja 123, *vimana* gilded by Tatacharya
128, his other gifts to 129, Sriranga's cap-
ture of 178, 220, 229, *hundi* on 446.

Tirūpparankunram epigraph, 66, 78, 150, 188,

Tiruppattur 336.

Tiruppulivanam 51.

Tiruppukkuli Inscription 49, 313N.

Tiruvadi (Tanjore Dt.) 201N, Zulfikar's camp at 351,
Tiruvakkarai 589.

Tiruvagaḷiswaramudayar temple, 49.

Tiruvāmattur, 197, 356, 457.

Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, road leading to 6, 11, 21, 41, 44, 46, 50
temple *prakaras* and gopura built by the
Gingee Nayak 88N, 147, temple built 202,
207, 252, Kesho Trimbak imprisoned at 263,
Zulfikar's attempt to capture it 294, 313N,
gate 335, Mughals at 336, 352, 449N, 481N1,
496, 206, 526, 530N,

Tiruvati (S. Arcot Dt.) 27, chief, a feudatory of Gingee
102, 104, 131N, 198, 317, 352, Muzaffar
Jang's retreat to 470, 471N, French attack
on 471N, 473 captured by the French 475,
battles at 475, 481N1, 517-22.

Tiruvēndipuram 397, Vishnu temple 400, grant of 402.
501-4.

Tiruvenkatam Pillai 434.

Tiruvonnainallur 352.

Tiruvikrama Perumal temple, 202.

Tiruvottiyur, grant of to the English, 361N, 447N.

Tittagudi 315.

Todar Mall, Lala the *sheristadar* 410N, sent to Gingee 410F, his report of Desing's behaviour 410N, his advance towards Gingee 424, 425, 426 his unsuccessful mediation 427.

Tondamandalam 34N, 36, 37, 48, 57, Narasa Nayaka's invasion upon 72, 73 governor of 117.

Tondiarpet 447N.

Toppur, battle of 135&N, also Tohur 135N, 144, date of the battle 145, 149, 166.

Tranquebar 207.

Travancore 70N, South 74N, 101, Sriranga III's invasion on 153, 358N.

Trenchfield, Richard 325N2, 374.

Trichinopoly, road leading to 32, district 43, 46, 74N, 134N, 144, 149, siege of 187, 188, 189, Nayak of 260, Zulfikar's march upon 294, Nayak of 316 his submission to Zulfikar 351, Raja of 365N, 440, 452N, 454, Maratha siege of 456, Asaf Jah's attempt to recover it from the Marathas 460, 461, 466 Muham-Ali's retirement to 468, 471&N, 474, 417N1, 506-8, 516.

Trikalinga kings 42.

Trimbak Rao 289.

Triplicane 349, scare in 361N.

Tristapitla, son of Anandakon of Gingee 83N.

Tughlak Muhammad-bin 60.

Tukoji. Tanjore Raja; his help to the Marathas, 442&N.

Tulapur 255.

Tumbur 481N1.

Tumkur 166.

Tundira, conquest of 52. 74, Tanjore's victory over 76.

Tungabadra, an island in the 258N2. 358N.

Tuzuk-i-Walajahi, the, 504.

Tyagadrug, 522-4, 528.

U

Udayagiri ; taken by Mir Jumla 164, Golkonda capture of 172, 449N.

Udayārpalayam 469. 530N1.

Ulundūrpet 207.

Ushaparinayam, The. a Telugu work 94.

Uttaramallur 106N, battle referred to 134N, 149, Uttiramerur 37.

V

Vajendragadh 449N.

Vaidya, Mr. C. V. referred to 211, 225.

Vaishnavism, its growth in South India 120, Vaishnavas 123&N.

Vaiyappa Nayaka 73, his conquests 73, 78, 81, 82, 85.

Valentine, referred to 217.

Vālikandapuram 218N, 229, 230N, 233.

Vallālaraya ruled over Gingee 41, 42, Ballala III 42.

Vallappa Danda Nayakar 44, called Vallappar and identified with Vallalaraya 44, king of Senji and son-in-law of Ballala IV, 45.

Valudāvūr 207, 208, Vardavur 274, 294, 356, 357, 373, Waldore 374N, rented out 377, 380, 381, 382&N, 386, plundered 388, 389, 392, 406, Desing's appeal for help to the ruler of 410N, *killedar* joined Desing-426, 449N, 457, 471N, Nasir Jang's advance towards 474, 497, 509, 521-2.

Vander Meer, head of the Dutch factory at Tegnapatam 119.

Vannāndurgam 449N.

Vanniyars, The 64.

Varadambikaparinayam, The 72.

Varadamambapuram 313N.

Varadapya Nayaka of Gingee, 78, 83&N, identified with
Krishnappa Nayaka 91, 92, 150, 188.

Varadaraja, author 123N.

Varadarajaswami temple at Conjeevaram 25N, 128.

Varahanadi, The, dam across built by the Nayaks, 88N,
building of the *mantapa* 88N, 410N, the
Sankaraparani of the ballad 428.

Varthema 189, 200N.

Vasco da Gama, the Portuguese chief 112, mentioned
200N.

Vayyāmbika, queen of Venkata I, 133.

Vedanta Desika, the great Vaishnava teacher 61, his
praise of Gopanarya 62, 79.

Velimedoupet 486, 487N1. 489N1, Nasir Jang's death at
500. 506, 512, 513N.

Vellālas. The 63, 64.

Vellar, The, 100, called Valarius by Du Jarric 100, 146.

Vellore gate or Arcot gate of Gingee 4, siege of 16N,
Krishnaraya's army encamped at 73, 74N.
Gate 96, 98N, the Nayak of 102, 103, 106N,
Venkata's residence at 107, 119, 126N
Nayaks: followers of Saivism 126N, 131N,
an account of the siege of 131N, became the
residence of Venkata in 1606. 131N, also
called Rayavelur 131N, 138, 139, 153N, loss
of 159, lost by Sriranga III 160, recovery of
160, 161, Arlour identified with 162, 165,
166, invested 169, 170, 171, fort invested by
Shahji 171, Sriranga's attempt to recover it
175, its siege by Shivaji 221, 222, 227, 232,
237, Rajaram at 257, 258N2, 295N1, 315,
325N2, Rajaram's escape to 332, Marathas
at 333, 336, 337&N, 347, 358N, 365&N,
jaghir granted to Ghulam Ali 438N, 449N,
killedar of 450. 458&N, 459. 481N, 498N, 502,
522.

Vélugōti family. chiefs of Kalahasti 94, history of, 134N, brothers of 157, an account of 313&N.

Vēlugotivarivamsāvali The 105.

Vengalamba, mother of Surappa Nayaka 90,

Venkata Boriah, Kavali 67N.

Venkatacharya, the Madura *dalavay* 452N.

Venkata I of Vijayanagar. 76, 90, 91, 92, called Venkatapatir in the Jesuit records, 92, 93, his imprisoning Krishnappa Nayaka and subsequent release 93, his death in A.D. 1614. 94, 98N, his gift to the Jesuit 98N, his residence 98N, 103, 104, his war with Krishnappa Nayaka 104, abandoned his march upon Gingee 105, sent a general instead 105, fight 106, his early wars with the Muhammadans referred to 106N, started for Gingee from Vellore 107, his letter to Philip III of Spain 109N, and the Portuguese 110, 111, his order for the expulsion of the Dutch 110, 111, 112, 120, 121, his patronage of Appayya Dikshita 126N, his leanings towards Saivism 126N, and Vaishnavism as well 128, the Vilapaka grant 126N, his relations with the Jesuits 130, his death 131, the civil war after his death 131N, his victory over Krishnappa referred to 131N, his victory over Lingama Nayaka of Vellore 131N, his wives 133, his nephews 135N, 137, 149, 153 and the ruler of Mysore 154, his administration 157, 158 and the Jesuits 191, 203, 204.

Venkata II. of Vijayanagar 94, brother-in-law of Venkatappa of Kalahasti 94.

Venkata. brother of the Kalahasti chief and commander of Venkata I's forces in Gingee 93, his defeat of Krishnappa Nayaka 93, his rule in Gingee 94, built a tank 94, belonged to the Velugoti family 94, 131N.

- Venkatagiri. chief of 134, 135N, under Yachama Nayak 148, taluk, 313N, help to the Nawab of the Carnatic 410N, 425.
- Venkatakrishna. Dubash 379.
- Venkatakrishna Nayak of Gingee 83&N.
- Venkatammal, a sister of Venkatapati Nayak 203.
- Venkatammalpettai 203.
- Venkatapathi Gautama. sent by the Mughal emperor to the south 332, 335, appointed *jaghirdar* of Pennattur 438.
- Venkatapati Nayak. Bala or Vala, 80, persecuted the Jains 80, also known as Dubala Krishnappa 81, identified with Tubaki Krishnappa 82, 150N, 203.
- Venkatappa Nayak of Gingee, 73, 74, 83, 88N. contemporary of Venkata I 91, identified with Krishnappa Nayaka 92.
- Venkatappa Nayaka called Moodu Venkatappa and son of Damarla Chenama Nayak, granted Madras to the English 95, his victory over Lingama Nayaka of Vellore 107.
- Venkataramaswami temple 7, 8, conservation of 19, 85N, 87, built by Muthialu Nayaka 87, 89, 201, 410N, 424, 520N.
- Venkataram Nayaka of Gingee 83&N.
- Venkata Rao, killedar of Arni, 410N.
- Venkatesapura, a village granted to Tatacharya 129.
- Venrumankonda Sambuvaraya, 49.
- Venugopalaswami temple, 9.
- Vepery. grant of, 325N2, 458N.
- Vepur Durgam. 449N.
- Verhoven, Admiral Pieter Willemsen, 113.
- Versailles, Records 476N, 479N.
- Very, M. 479N, 513N.
- Vettavalam 33, woods 296, 317, 356, 357. Vettavanam poligar of 465.
- Vico, Fr. referred to 65, 190.

Vijayanagar. its style of architecture in Gingee 6, 10 rulers of 25, and Kobilingan 34, rulers at Gingee 37, conquest of Gingee 41, their attitude towards the agriculturists 64, 70N, Nayaks under 77, emperor's help in the consecration of Govindaraja at Chidambaram 79N, 83N, and Vaishnavism 120, and the Chidambaram temple 122, empire and the civil war 131, its causes 135N, duration of the war 137, results of the war 147-8, 151N, 167, disruption of the empire 172, results 181N, 188, empire and its organisation 188-9, its tributaries 190-1, its palmy days 193-4, state interference in social matters 198-204, offer of betel, a custom; its origin 199-200, civil war referred to 205, its glory and legacy 205.

Vijayappa Nayaka of Gingee 83&N.

Vijayaraghavaswami. God 313N.

Vijayaraghava Nayaka, general of Krishnadevaraya, 73, 74.

Vijayaraghava Nayaka of Tanjore, author 75N, son of Raghunatha 76, 144N2, 146.

Vijayaraghava vamsavali. The 75N.

Vijayaranga Nayak, governor 83N, got Gingee as *jaghir* from Krishnappa Nayaka 83N.

Vijayindra Tirtha, the Madhwa Guru 126N.

Vikrama Chola, 123N.

Vikramapura, See Kannanur.

Vikravandi 517-9.

Vilapaka grant of Venkata I, 131N.

Villianur (Villenour) 489N1, 509, 522-3.

Villupuram. 470, 476, 481N, 486, Belpur 490N, 495-7, 504, 513N, 516, 519, 511.

Vilukkam 513N.

Virabhadra Nayaka of Ikkeri, his defeat of Kenga Hanuma 155, his complaint to Bijapur, 156.

Virana, nephew of Ballala IV. 45N.

- Vira Narasimha III. the Hoysala 43, his fighting with his brother 43, 44.
 Vira Ramanatha : the Hoysala, 43.
 Vira Saiva Gurus 126N.
 Vira Someswara : the Hoysala 42, his conquest of the Chola 42, 43, his death 43&N.
 Vira Vijayarayar 41.
 Virinchipuram 48, identified with Marakatapuri 50, defeat of Sambuvaraya at, 58.
 Virupakshapattana, founded by Ballala III, 46.
 Virupaksha, son of Harihara II, 51, 55, 71, 72.
 Virupaksha II. referred to 130.
 Vishalgad, Raja Ram's escape to, 255, 256.
 Vishnu, Lord 52.
 Viswanatha Hoysala 44.
 Vittala Raja, governor of Vijayanagar 103.
 Vittala temple at Pandharpur. 130.
 Vivers, Capt. 380.
 Vizagapatam. 272N1, chief of 278, 349, 356.
 Vriddhachalam, : the building of the *prakara*, gopura etc. by the Gingee Nayaks, 88N, 449N, 521.
 Vyasarpadi. 361N. granted to the English 447N.

W

- Wagingera, seige of 292.
 Wandiwash, Raja of 41, 94, chief of 157, Mughal capture of 252, Maratha defeat at 262, Mughal camp at 262, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309 to 311, 313, 314, return of Mughal army to 317, 320N, 321, 325N2, 328, 330N, 337N, 365N, 449N, 452, 460, 470, 485-6, 494, 513N, 521, 530N.
 Waring, Scott. referred to and quoted 13, 14, 15.
 White Town (Madras), fortifications of 447N.
 Wilks. Col. referred to, 213, 215N, 225, 452N, 530N.
 William III. King of England. 281N1.
 William, Fort. 325N2.

Wilson, Prof. H. H. 67N.

Wood, Capt. 521.

Woodga Naik, 377&N.

Wynad. 39.

Wynch, Alexander 503.

X

Xavier. St. Francis, 70N.

Y

Yachama Nayaka. Velugoti chief 105, his capture of Gingee 106, an account of him 106N, his early wars 106N, and the civil war 131&N, his capture of Gingee 131N, leader of the loyalists 134, his early victories 134N, *alias* Yachasura 134N, 135N, *alias* Pedda Yachama Nayudu and Yachasurudu 140, Yachamahipa 140N, his refusal to join Jaggaraya 140, 141, 142, his victory over Yatiraja 146, his later wars with Yatiraja 147N, 148, his title 148, his military exploits 149, his younger brother 149.

Yachama Nayaka, *alias* Raja Bangaru Yachama Naidu of the Velugoti family; and also Yachappa Nayaka 258N2, his rebellion 288&N, 289 298, 307, 313&N, an account of his gifts 313N, 315, his letter to the Mughal emperor 317, was put to death by Zulfikar Khan 317, 319, 320&N, 410N, his son, 428N.

Yachama Nayaka. Bangaru Kumara: also Sarvagna Kumara Yachendra, son of Yachama, 318, installed as mansabdar 352, his help to Zulfikar Khan 425, 428N.

Yadavas of Devagiri. the 199.

Yagnanarayana Dikshita, son of Govinda Dikshita, 75N, 77.

Yakub Khan, 498.

Yale, Mr. Elihu. his mission to Gingee 208, 209, 241, got privilege at Cuddalore 241, Governor of Madras 270, 272&N1, sent to Gingee 275, 281N1, his help requested by the Marathas 287, 325N2, 374.

Yale. Mr. Thomas. 270, 279, 280, 281&N1.

Yatiraja, brother of Jaggaraya. 106N, his part in the civil war 146, his defeat 147&N.

Yembollum. damage done to 374N.

Yesubai. Sambhaji's widow, 253, her administration 253-4&N, captured by the Mughals, 255, 264

Z

Zamorin of Calicut. his alliance with the Dutch 108.

Zinatunnisa Princess Begum Sahiba, second daughter of Aurangzib: her friendly attitude to Shambhaji's widow and son 255, her attachment towards Sivaji, 256.

Zūlfikar Khan Nusrat Jang, Nawab and commander in chief of the Mughal forces: his siege of Gingee 16N, 23, 272N1, his *farman* to the English 285, despatch to the Carnatic 286, 286, his terms to the English 286, 287, also Dhul Faqar Khan 288, at Gingee 288, attacked by the Marathas 288N, 289, his advance upon Gingee 289, 291, his march towards the South and return after plunder 294, his advice to Raja Ram to surrender the fort 295&N1, his siege of Gingee 296, 297, failure and further plans 298, his watch over Kambaksh 301-2, 303, 304&N, 305, accused of treachery 312, his retreat to Wandiwash 313&N, 314, 315, his arrival at Tanjore 316; his renewed attack on Gingee 317, his collusion with the Marathas 317, his charge against Yachama Nayaka 317, 319, his prolonged siege 321, his victory at Arni

328, his financial difficulties 328, 329&N, his renewed attack 330&N, got the title of Nasrat Jang 330N, his prolonged siege-show 331, his collusion with the Marathas 332, 333 ; entered Gingee 334, his kind treatment of the Maratha royal family 334, title Amir-ul-umara, 335, 336, occupied Gingee 337, called Gingee Nasratgadh 338, 339, 340, an account of his capture of Gingee 341, and cruelties 341-2, 344, 346, 347, 348, his letter to the English 348, restoration of order in Gingee and its neighbourhood 351, 352, 353, gave Sarup singh the *killedari* of Gingee 355, made over the administration and returned to Aurangzib 356, 357, appointed subhedar 360&N, his conquest of Gingee referred to 374, grant of *cowle* to the English 374, 379, 394, 399, his earlier grant to the English referred to 402, 425, 428N.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Appropriate notes have been supplied in the course of the book on many of the sources of information).

A

Archæological, Epigraphic and Record sources.

Archæological Survey of India Reports, 1908-9 and 1911-12.

A Topographical List of the Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency (collected till 1915), by V. Rangacharya, Vols. I-III, Madras, 1919.

Epigraphia Carnatica, Vols. III (1894), V (1902) and X (1905).

Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III (1894-95).

Lists of the Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras, compiled by R. Sewell, Vol. I (1882), Madras.

A. T. Pringle—Diary and Consultation Books of Fort St. George 1681-1685—Madras 1893-5.

Selections from the Records of the South Arcot District—Cuddalore 1870.

Fort St. George Records.

Series.

Fort St. David Consultations.

Letters from Fort St. David.

Letters from Fort St. George.

Letters to Fort St. David.

Letters to Fort St. George.

Military Country Correspondence.

Public Country Correspondence.

Public Consultations.

Memoires of François Martin, Vols. I-III, Ed. by A. Martineau, 1934.

- Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai, 1736-61, Vols. I—XII, Madras. (Translated in English by Price and Dodwell) 1904-28.
- The Madras Despatches, 1744-55. H. H. Dodwell (1920).
do 1754-65. do (1930).
- The Calendar of Madras Records, 1740-44. H. H. Dodwell, (1917).
- European Manuscripts in the India Office Library, Vol. II, Part II—Minor Collections and Miscellaneous. Kaye and Johnston. Section I. Kaye, (1937).
- India Office Records—Home Miscellaneous Series, by S. C. Hill, (1927).
- A Calendar of the Court Minutes, etc. of the East India Company. (Edited by E. B. Sainsbury) 1916—32.
- The English Factories in India from 1618 (A Calendar of Documents in the India Office and the British Museum)—edited by W. Foster and others 1906—27.
- Dutch Records—Dagh Register (Batavia Diary) 1640 etc.
- La Mission du Madure.

B

Indigenous Sources, Literary and Historical

- Bahulasvacharitram of Kalahasti Damarla Vengala Bhupala.
- Catalogue Raisonné of Oriental Mss: 3 volumes, by Rev. W. Taylor, 1857.
- Chatupadya Ratnakaram.
- Jaimini Bharatamu of Pillalamarri Pinavirabhadra.
- The Jedhe Chronology.
- Karnataka Rajakkal Savistaracharitram. (Mack Mss.)

- Koyilolugu (Ms. in the Mackenzie Collection).
- Kulottunga Cholan Ula, (1925).
- Ma'athir-al-Umara of Shahnawaz Khan (Biblio. Indica).
- Madhuravijayam or Vira Kamparaya Charitram by
Gangadevi, ed. and Harihara Sastri, by
Srinivasa Sastri Trivandrum, 1916.
- Maduraittalavaralaru.
- Basatin-al-Salatin (of Al Zubairi?)
- Narayana Vilasam of Prince Virupaksha.
- Historical Sketch of the Kingdom of Pandya by H. H.
Wilson, 1838.
- Periya Tirumozhi, of Tirumangai Alwar, (1930).
- Prapannamrtam of Anantarya.
- Raghunathabhyudayam of Ramabhadramba, ed. by Dr.
T. R. Chintamani, University of Madras,
1934.
- Raghunathabhyudaya Natakam of Vijayaraghava Na-
yaka.
- Rairi Bakhar.
- Rahat Afzah of Mir Najaf Ali Khan.
- Ramabhyudayam of Saluva Narasimha.
- Ramanujarya Divya Charitai of Pillai Lokam Jiyar,
(1886).
- Ramarajiyamu of Venkayya.
- Sa'id Namah of Jaswant Ray.
- Sabhasad Bakhar (1694).
- Sahitya Ratnakara, of Yagnanarayana Dikshita, ed. by
Dr. T. R. Chintamani, 1932.
- Sangita Sudha of Govinda Dikshita.
- Sivabharat of Paramananda.
- Sivatattva Ratnakara of Keladi Basava
- Sources of Vijayanagar History (Madras University
Historical Series I). Ed. by Dr. S. K.
Aiyangar, 1919.

Seydak-kadi Nondi Natakam—ed. by Dr. S. M. Husayn Nainar (1939).

Sukraniti (text) 1890.

Takkayagapparani of Ottakuttan (Ed. by Mm. V. Swaminatha Aiyar, 1930).

Tanjavuri Andhra Rajula Charitramu.

Tirukkovaigar of Manikkavasagar.

Tuzak-i-Walajahi of Burhanu'd-din—English tr. by Dr. S. Md. Husayn Nainar, Parts I & II, 1934-39.

Ushaparinayam of Anka Bhupala.

Vaishnava Guruparampara.

Varadambika Parinayam of Tirumalamba.

Vasudevacharitam (Bhagavata) of Varadaraja.

Vélugótivárivamsávali, ed. with introduction by Dr. N. V. Ramanayya, University of Madras.

Vijayaraghava Vamsavali of Chengalvala Kalakavi.

C

Historical and other works including Travellers' Accounts and Selections of Original Material.

Anandaranga Pillai, The "Pepys" of French India by C. S. Srinivasachari, 1940.

Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagara by the Rev. Fr. H. Heras, 1927.

Bussy in the Deccan (Being extracts from 'Bussy and French India' by A. Martineau.) by A. Cammiade.

The Colas, by K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Vol. II, 1937.

Chronological Tables for Southern India from the Sixth Century by R. Sewell, 1887.

Description of Hindustan and the Adjacent Countries, by W. Hamilton, Vol. II: 1820.

- An Indian Ephemeris A.D. 700 to 1779 by L. D. Swamikannu Pillai (1922) Vol. VI.
- An Ephemeris (showing the corresponding dates according to the English, Hindu and Musalman Calendars) from A.D. 1751 until 1850 by C. P. Brown, 1850.
- Comparative Tables of Muhammadan and Christian Dates by Wolseley Haig (1932).
- Fifth Report from the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company, Madras Presidency (London 1812), Madras, 1863.
- History of the Deccan by Ferishta, by Jonathan Scott, Vol. II, 1794.
- History of India as told by its own Historians, by Elliot and Dowson, Vol. VII. 1877.
- A Family History of the Venkatagiri Rajas. by A. Jagannadha Sastri.
- History of Aurangzib, Vols. I-V by J. N. Sarkar, 1912-24.
- History of the Carnatic and Kurnool of Burhanu'd-din.
- A History of Madras by C. S. Srinivasachari, 1939.
- A History of the Mahrattas by E. Scott Waring (1810).
- Historical Fragments of the Moghul Empire, of the Morattoes and the English Concerns in Indostan by Robert Orme (1805).
- History of the Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan, by R. Orme (4th ed. 1861-62).
- Historical Sketches of South India in an attempt to trace the History of Mysoor etc., by M. Wilks, Vol. II (1869).
- The Jesuits and the Great Moghul, E. Maclagan (1932).
- The Jesuits in Malabar by D. Ferroli, Vol. I (1939).
- Karnataka Kavi Charite, by Rao Bahadur R. A. Narasimhacharya, Vol. II, 1924.
- The Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume (1936).

Life of Lord Clive by Sir George Forrest, 2 Vols. (1918).
 Life of Shivaji Maharaj by Takakhav and Keluskar, 1921.

The Madras Census Report, 1891.

Manual of Administration of the Madras Presidency in illustration of the Records of Government and the Yearly Administration Reports, in 3 volumes, Vol. III, Glossary, (1893).

Madras in the Olden Time by Talboys Wheeler, 3 volumes, (1882).

Monumental Remains of the Dutch East India Company in the Presidency of Madras by A. Rea (1897).

Mysore Gazetteer, New Edition, by C. Hayavadana Rao, Vol. II, Parts I-IV, (1930).

A Narrative of the Military Operations on the Coromandel Coast by Major I. Munro, (1789).

The Nawab Imadu'l-Mulk Memorial Volume, Hyderabad.

The Nayaks of Madura by R. Satyanatha Aiyar, (1924),

The Nayaks of Tanjore by V. Vridhagirisan (1942).

Persian Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey, by C.A. Storey, Section II. Fasciculus 3.(History of India), (1939).

Proceedings of Meetings of the Indian Historical Records Commission. Vols. I-XVIII. (1919-1942).

Rise of the Peshwas, by H. N. Sinha Vol. I, (1931).

Selections from the Peshwa Daftar, No. 10 (1931).

Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire, Vols. I and II by B. A. Saletore (1934).

South Arcot District Manual by J. H. Garstin (1878).

South Arcot District Gazetteer—W. Francis, Vol. I—(1900); Vol. II—1915.

South Indian Chronological Tables by Krishnaswami Naidu and Sewell, (1894).

- South India and Her Muhammadan Invaders by Dr. S. K. Aiyangar. (1921).
- Studies in Indian History by Dr. S. N. Sen (1930).
- The Tamil Lexicon (University of Madras)—Vols. I-VI, (1926-36).
- Vestiges of Old Madras by H. D. Love, Vol. II—(1913).
- History in Muhammad Nama by Prof. B. D. Verma.
- The Shivaji Souvenir, Tercentenary Celebration, Bombay, 3rd May 1927.
- Keshavapandit's Rajaram-Charitam or Shri Chhatrapati Rajaram's Journey to Jinji: edited by V. S. Bendrey. (1931).
- Qutbshahi of Golcondah in the Seventeenth Century—B. I. S. N. Mandali Publication, containing (1) The History of a Late Revolution in the Kingdom of Golconda, (2) Hadiqat-u'l-ālam (3) Some Account of Akana and Madana Chief Ministers of Tanashah Badshah of Golconda. (all from Mackenzie Collection).
- Ibn Battuta, Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-1354. Translated and selected by H. A. R. Gibb (Broadway Travellers, 1929).
- Akbar and the Jesuits. An Account of the Jesuit Missions to the Court of Akbar—Translated with introduction and notes by C. H. Payne. (Broadway Travellers 1926).
- Foreign Biographies of Shivaji by S. N. Sen. Extracts and Documents relating to Maratha History, Vol. II, (1927).
- Storia do Mogor of Niccolao Manucci Ed. by W. Irvine (Indian Texts), 1907—8 Vol. III.
- Travels and Voyages in the East Indies by J. Nieuhoff, 1703.
- Stringer Lawrence, the Father of the Indian Army by J. Biddulph, (1901).

- Cambridge R. O. Account of the War in India between the English and French on the Coast of Coromandel, 1750-1760. (1761).
- Temple, Sir Richard Carnac—The Diaries of Streynsham Master, 1675-1680 (Indian Records Series). (1911).
- Wilson H. H., Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms, (1855).
- Wilson H. H., Descriptive Catalogue of the Oriental Manuscripts collected by the late Lieutenant-Colonel Colin Mackenzie. Calcutta, (1828).
- Wilson, Lieutenant-Colonel W. J., History of the Madras Army. 1882.
- William Foster: The Founding of Fort St. George, Madras. 1902.
- Histoire Détaillée des Rois du Carnatic par Narayanpouille, traduite du Tamoul et annotée par Gnanou Diagou, (1939).
- J. N. Sarkar—Studies in Mughal India (1919).
- J. N. Sarkar. The House of Shivaji (1941)..
- Oriental Biographical Dictionary—by T. Beale, revised by H. G. Keene (1894).
- Hobson-Jobson by Yule and Burnell, revised by W. Crooke, (1903).
- Dictionary of Indian Biography by C. E. Buckland, 1906.

D-Journals

- Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras—Vols. III and IV.
- The Annamalai University Journal, Vols. VIII. IX & X.
- The Indian Antiquary, Vols. LIV & LV.
- The Journal of Indian History, Vols. V, IX, XI, XVI & XVII.
- The Journal of the Madras University—Vol. IV.
- The Madras Journal of Literature and Science.

ERRATA

PAGE	FOOT- NOTE	LINE	FOR	READ
47	N	3	B. N. Saletore	B. A. Saletore
63	N	5	Invader	Invaders
75	N	12-13	Illuminating	an illuminating
92		12	indentification	identification
104		9	Trivati	Tiruvati
150		16	Amdala	Andola (Andoloka)
150		17	was	way
168		25	noteworth	noteworthy
190		22	plundered	were plundered
201	N	1	1924-Sevvappa	1596-Achyut- appa
205		3-4	resources, before	resources as before
245		12	seige	siege
246		8	seige	siege
247		2	letter	latter
250		26	sat	set
253		21	seige	siege
259	N	29	canalry	cavalry
276		11	One of the main reasons.	"One of the main reasons.
286	Chapter heading		Seige	Siege
288	N 3		poligas	poligars

X

PAGE	FOOT- NOTE	LINE	FOR	READ
295		23	beseiged	besieged
296		16	beseiged	besieged
297		17	sufficient troop	sufficient troops.
304		22	Singhor army	besieging army
321	N	20	consequent an all	consequent on all
333		24	to the top of	at the top of
363		2	Burhanibu	Burhan-ibn
363		4	picture of the	picture of him
402		2	from from	from
418		17	as a man	a man
419		16	Mack. Mass	Mack. Mss.
429	N 1	1	S. J. Epigraph- ist's Report.	S. I. Epigraph- ist's Report.
435	N	2	1914	1714
476		6	seige	siege
477		11	seige	siege
481		3	seige	siege
483	N	20	fo be much	to be much
487		7	in the middle	in the middle of
487	N 1	15	Qnran	Quran
500		28	of fhe town	of the town
501		2	essay on Clive : " the column	essay on Clive and adds that " the column
502		4	of them as fol- lows :—	of them is as follows :—

PAGE	FOOT- NOTE	LINE	FOR	READ
503		22	worte	wrote
503		24	Nasir Jung	Nasir Jang
513	N 1	18	Muslims	Muslim
			historian	historian
515		2	seige	siege
522		14	of Valudavur	Valudavur
524		14	an convoy	a convoy
526		10	unpercieved	unperceived
527		8	siezed	seized
527		20	was not be expected	was not to be expected
527		22	On the every day	On the very day
529		17	stategic	strategic
530	N	19	Liteuenant	Lieutenant
